40353

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* ANN ELIZABETH WOLFE

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* RESPONSES OF NEOPHYTE AND EXPERENCED TEACHERS OF ART IN MATTERS AFFECTING THEIR PROFESSIONAL WELL-BEING.

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA.

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* M. ED.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1978

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* DR. R. N. MACGREGOR

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* July 26/78 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* AE Wolfe

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXÉ*
323 SPYHILL RD. N.W.
CALGARY, ALTA.
T2K 3N9

NL-91 (3-74)

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (3/77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RESPONSES OF NEOPHYTE AND EXPERIENCED TEACHERS OF ART IN MATTERS AFFECTING THEIR PROFESSIONAL WELL-BEING

by

Ⓒ ANN ELIZABETH WOLFE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1978

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Responses of Neophyte and Experienced Teachers of Art in Matters Affecting Their Professional Well-Being," submitted by Ann Elizabeth Wolfe, in partial fulfilment for the degree of Master of Education.

Ronald W. MacGregor
Supervisor

L D Stewart

J. Fris.

Date 2 December 1977

ABSTRACT

Problem

This study dealt with some areas of great concern among a sample of art teachers in Alberta who had been trained by and for the provincial education system. The purpose was to determine if significant changes of perception about art teaching occurred among teachers as their experience in the field increased. The literature revealed some considerations for the interests of candidates in art education, but little documented research could be found regarding the differences between neophyte and experienced art teachers on their perceptions of the art teacher's role.

Procedures

A questionnaire was devised based on the concerns of art teachers mentioned in the literature. Three main areas in art teaching were considered: facilities, human elements, and curricular considerations. Respondents were asked to register their agreement with each of 50 statements on a 5-point agreement-disagreement scale.

The questionnaire was administered to prospective art teachers (those who had completed their student teaching experiences but had not yet held teaching positions) and beginning and experienced practising teachers. A total of 110 respondents were placed in categories according to their number of years of teaching experience, percentage of art taught, and university attended.

For each item, the percentage level responses of the total sample was registered. A chi-square test was used to determine significant differences between responses of experience levels, percentage levels, and university groups.

Summary

The study revealed a number of areas where perceptions differed between experience levels of art teachers and between art teachers who were given various amounts of art to teach. These differences were particularly significant among the considerations of human relations. Results indicated that prospective teachers held many perceptions of art teaching that differed vastly from those held by beginning teachers, and that the former group generally held more positive expectations of the art teaching situation than did the teachers in their first two years of practice. Strong differences in perception also occurred with teachers having low percentages of art teaching responsibilities. Similarity of results between university groups supported the commonalities between the two major institutions of art teacher training in the province.

Essentially, the results of the study suggested a need for internship experiences and in-service programs for beginning art teachers, to help those teachers meet the expectations and goals which brought them to art teaching.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. R. N. MacGregor for his generous contributions of advice and assistance. Thanks are due also to the members of my thesis committee, Dr. J. Fris, Dr. L. Stewart, and Dr. J. Simpson.

The co-operation of the Calgary and Edmonton Public and Separate School Boards and the Government of Alberta Department of Education, Fine Arts Department facilitated the conduct of this study. The efforts of Dr. Vern Dravland of the University of Lethbridge, Department of Educational Research, provided valuable assistance in statistical analysis. Mrs. Elise L. Wittig is gratefully acknowledged for her editorial and typing contributions.

My thanks are extended to my friends, Thelma and Douglas Boughton for two years of encouragement and assistance. Finally, I express my gratitude to my parents who have always been a source of inspiration and unfailing support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v

LIST OF TABLES x

Chapter

1 INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY 1

  INTRODUCTION 1

  STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 3

  DEFINITION OF TERMS 6

    Art Education 6

    Attitude 6

    Institutions 6

    Beginning Teacher 6

    Perception 7

    Prospective Teacher 7

    Experienced Teacher 7

  RATIONALE 7

  DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 13

  LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 14

2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 16

  INTRODUCTION 16

  MOTIVATING FACTORS FOR PROSPECTIVE ART TEACHERS 17

Chapter Page

THE PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF THE ART TEACHER 22

INITIAL AND LONG-TERM ADJUSTMENTS FOR THE ART TEACHER 30

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ART TEACHER AND THE SCHOOL AS A SOCIAL SYSTEM 38

CURRICULAR CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE ART TEACHER 46

SOCIETAL INFLUENCES ON THE ART TEACHING SITUATION 50

SUMMARY 54

3 DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF THE STUDY 56

SUBJECTS 57

DESIGN OF THE INSTRUMENT AND DATA COLLECTION 58

4 ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA 62

INTRODUCTION 62

DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE 62

Prospective Teachers 64

Beginning Teachers 64

Experienced Teachers 64

Respondents from the University of Alberta 64

Respondents from the University of Calgary 65

ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS 66

SECTION A: THE WORKING ENVIRONMENT 66

SUMMARY OF SECTION A: THE WORKING ENVIRONMENT 87

Chapter Page

Total Responses 87

Experience Levels 88

Percentage Levels of Art Taught 89

SECTION B: THE HUMAN ELEMENTS 90

SUMMARY OF SECTION B: THE HUMAN ELEMENTS 118

Total Responses 118

Experience Levels 120

Percentage Levels of Art Taught 123

University Attended 125

SECTION C: CURRICULAR CONSIDERATIONS 126

SUMMARY OF SECTION C: CURRICULAR CONSIDERATIONS . . . 141

Total Responses 141

Experience Levels 142

Percentage Levels of Art Taught 144

University Attended 145

5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 146

INTRODUCTION 146

SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS 147

Problems Perceived in Art Teaching 147

Problems as Related to Experience Levels 151

Problems as Related to Percentage of Art Taught . . . 156

Problems as Related to University Attended 160

SUMMARY 160

IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE 166

REFERENCES CITED 171

Chapter Page

APPENDICES 175

A Questionnaire 176

B Transmittal Letter 184

C Section A (Tables 53 - 61) 186

D Section B (Tables 62 - 70) 196

E Section C (Tables 71 - 79) 206

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1 Sample Selection 61

2 Description of Respondents 63

3 Item 1 67

4 Item 2 69

5 Item 3 70

6 Item 6 71

7 Item 10 72

8 Item 4 74

9 Item 8 75

10 Item 5 76

11 Item 9 77

12 Item 11 78

13 Item 7 79

14 Item 12 81

15 Item 13 82

16 Item 14 83

17 Item 15 85

18 Item 16 86

19 Item 17 92

20 Item 18 93

21 Item 32 95

22 Item 20 96

Table Page

23 Item 29 97

24 Item 36 98

25 Item 19 99

26 Item 21 100

27 Item 24 101

28 Item 27 103

29 Item 25 104

30 Item 22 105

31 Item 28 107

32 Item 33 108

33 Item 23 110

34 Item 34 111

35 Item 35 113

36 Item 30 114

37 Item 26 116

38 Item 31 117

39 Item 37 127

40 Item 39 128

41 Item 44 129

42 Item 46 130

43 Item 38 131

44 Item 40 132

45 Item 48 133

46 Item 49 134

47 Item 41 135

Table Page

48 Item 42 136

49 Item 43 137

50 Item 45 138

51 Item 47 139

52 Item 50 140

53 Section A: Total Responses 187

54 Section A: Experience Levels, Prospective Teachers . . . 188

55 Section A: Experience Levels, Beginning Teachers 189

56 Section A: Experience Levels, Experienced Teachers . . . 190

57 Section A: Percentage of Art Taught, Prospective Teachers 191

58 Section A: Percentage of Art Taught, 26% to 50% 192

59 Section A: Percentage of Art Taught, 51% to 75% 193

60 Section A: Percentage of Art Taught, 75% to 100% 194

61 Section A: University Attended 195

62 Section B: Total Responses 197

63 Section B: Experience Levels, Prospective Teachers . . . 198

64 Section B: Experience Levels, Beginning Teachers 199

65 Section B: Experience Levels, Experienced Teachers . . . 200

66 Section B: Percentage of Art Taught, Prospective Teachers 201

67 Section B: Percentage of Art Taught, 26% to 50% 202

68 Section B: Percentage of Art Taught, 51% to 75% 203

Table Page

69 Section B: Percentage of Art Taught, 76% to 100% 204

70 Section B: University Attended 205

71 Section C: Total Responses 207

72 Section C: Experience Levels, Prospective Teachers . . . 208

73 Section C: Experience Levels, Beginning Teachers 209

74 Section C: Experience Levels, Experienced Teachers . . . 210

75 Section C: Percentage of Art Taught, Prospective Teachers 211

76 Section C: Percentage of Art Taught, 26% to 50% 212

77 Section C: Percentage of Art Taught, 51% to 75% 213

78 Section C: Percentage of Art Taught, 76% to 100% 214

79 Section C: University Attended 215

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The art teacher occupies a central role in determining the success of an art program. Whether that success is being measured within a single school or throughout a school system, the quality of the art education inevitably depends upon his ability to implement proficiently a serious and effective program. On this premise rests the teacher's personal satisfaction, the satisfaction of his students, and of those who evaluate the relative importance of art within the total curriculum.

In order for the art teacher to administer a vigorous program, certain fundamental conditions must exist. The teacher must feel sufficiently confident of his ability to teach art, and be sufficiently well prepared to do so. He must feel that the curriculum he is implementing conforms to what he judges to be the best purposes of art education. He must have adequate facilities in which to teach the subject of art and he must have sufficient co-operation and support from his colleagues to permit him to carry out his program in humane conditions.

The fulfilment of these conditions in a given situation must influence the teacher's attitude toward his chosen field as well as his own particular position in a school. The extent to which fulfilment occurs merits scrutiny, as it applies to teacher preparation, the part it plays in teacher satisfaction, and particularly the decision to remain in the teaching profession.

The expense, both to the teacher himself and to the governing body or the province which supports the training institutions, is too great to allow waste to occur through the discouragement, frustration, and final resignation of carefully trained personnel. Also, the loss of a qualified teacher is detrimental to the continuity of a school's program.

Whether the attrition rate among art teachers is as high as rumour and occasional anecdote would indicate is an important question and one on which evidence is lacking.

Another important question concerns the exact reasons for teacher turnover; most explanations are speculative, and not founded on empirical analysis. Teachers who resign do not usually give a detailed explanation for doing so. School boards do not concern themselves with reasons for departures; rather, their major concern must be with replacements. High teacher turnover as a result of pregnancy, the desire to travel, the transfer of a spouse, and many other reasons often unconnected with the frustration caused by unmet needs such as those identified above, make it difficult to single out and describe particular reasons for resignation.

Whether the problem of teacher turnover is attributed to the training of the teacher or to the system he enters upon graduation, there is a need to analyse the problem and perhaps find ways to improve the durability and increase the effectiveness of the teacher.

One of the tasks that needs to be undertaken to achieve such ends is to understand the sources from which the competencies of teaching may be derived and to identify the conditions that militate against teacher effectiveness (Eisner, 1972:10). Writers like Neufeld (1971) have said that research is needed to identify the factors which occasion changes in motives of teachers once they have been in the field a number of years. Hence, if the attitudes, concerns, and other motives of practising, experienced teachers differ greatly from those of student teachers and beginning teachers, this information should be established and the reasons investigated.

In this respect, art teachers are no different from their colleagues in the other subject areas, and it seems totally appropriate to consult the literature of teacher education in a general sense for information which may help to clarify some of these questions and issues. At the same time, there may well be factors uncovered in the course of this study which have particular relevance to art teacher satisfaction.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem with which this study is concerned must now be defined with some specificity. It has been intimated that numbers of teachers do terminate their professional careers prematurely. Some do so even before they take charge of their own classroom; others last only a year or two, then resign; still others withdraw from the teaching field with several years of teaching experience behind them.

Given that a certain percentage of these resignations occurs because of events unconnected with teaching, what of the remainder?

Does it reflect dissatisfaction, frustration, boredom, or personal incompatibility with general policies within a school or a school district? At present, answers to these questions are unavailable. The problem was to identify at first hand those factors directly related to the art teaching process which cause teachers to resign prematurely from the profession.

Specifically, two objectives were set: First, to describe some of the significant changes of perception about classroom teaching which occur among art teachers as their experience of teaching increases. To this end, the study describes the extent to which discontinuities appear to exist among perceptions of the role of the art teacher held by art education students in the universities of the province, and by neophyte and experienced teachers of art. Second, to compare (1) the perceptions held by art teachers who teach very little art in their timetables with those of teachers whose art teaching load constitutes all or nearly all of their teaching timetable; and (2) the perceptions of art teachers trained at the University of Alberta and art teachers trained at the University of Calgary.

The study describes the nature of the differences in these perceptions and the characteristics of discrepancies perceived within three general areas of the art teaching situation:

1. The working environment--the physical aspects of the art teaching situation and the art teacher's career aspirations.
2. The human elements--the role of the administration, colleagues, students, and parents in facilitating the operation of the art curriculum.

3. Curricular considerations--student and teacher preferences regarding program context, program planning, grading, philosophy of the art teacher: the elements of art as a subject within the school program.

Two questions provided the focus for investigation:

1. How are some of the important matters affecting art teachers' well-being perceived by prospective teachers, beginning teachers, and experienced teachers?
2. May these differences in perception be attributable to
   (a) length of experience of the art teacher?
   (b) percentage of art taught by the art teacher?
   (c) the institution attended for teacher training in art?

For the purposes of this study, these questions are represented in the form of null hypotheses:

H_o1 There are no significant differences between three groups of art teachers (prospective, beginning, and experienced teachers) in their perceptions of matters affecting art teachers' well-being.

H_o2 There are no significant differences between teachers engaged in teaching art for differing percentages of time, in their perceptions of matters affecting art teachers' well-being.

H_o3 There are no significant differences between art teachers who have graduated from the two major teacher training institutions in Alberta, in their perceptions of matters affecting art teachers' well-being.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following are working definitions for the purposes of this thesis:

Art Education

The university program of studies undertaken by persons wishing to become qualified as art teachers.

Attitude

An evaluative reaction to a situation based on concepts developed from previous experiences. H. C. Triandes (1971) examined the definitions of many attitude theorists and has concluded that attitudes are comprised of three major components:

1. A cognitive component (the idea)
2. An affective component (the emotion which charges the idea)
3. A behavioural component (predisposition to action)

Institutions

1. Places in which teacher training occurs (designated here as teacher training institutions)
2. Places in which art teaching is conducted (specifically, schools)

Beginning Teacher

A teacher in the first or second year of his teaching career.

Perception

An impression or awareness gained through observation.

Prospective Teacher

A university student enrolled in an art education program who aspires to a teaching career.

Experienced Teacher

A teacher who has completed two or more years of teaching.

RATIONALE

Teachers appear to pass through three distinguishable stages in a progression that extends from novice to veteran. These may be described as the prospective teacher stage, which lasts from entry in a teacher training program until graduation from the teacher education institution; the beginning teacher stage, lasting from the teacher's appointment to his first school until the end of the second year of teaching; and the experienced teacher stage, which begins after several years of teaching and lasts until retirement or resignation. The attitudes of the student teacher or practising teacher towards teaching tend to change as he progresses through these stages; and his expectations change as he experiences the influences of, first, the teacher training institution, and then the actual teaching situation.

Kass and Wheeler (1975) have proposed a developmental sequence of teacher professional growth consisting of three stages, which reflects some of these changes:

Stage I Concern over self (teacher-centered period)

Stage II Concern over instructional matters (content-structure period)

Stage III Concern over individual learning problems (student-centered period)

Expectations about the role of the art teacher as perceived by a prospective candidate may differ greatly from the actual situation he encounters as a practising teacher. These expectations are acquired from several sources: the view of teaching gained from his own experiences in school, the conceptions of teaching engendered by university programs, and that projected by student-teaching experiences. These role expectations may be linked with those previously mentioned to form expectations about the art program to be presented, anticipation of the physical facilities available to him as an art teacher, and expectations about his role and that of his subject in relation to the administration, colleagues, students, and parents of the school where he will serve.

The first conception gained of the role of the teacher is that offered by the individual's own school experience. By the time he has finished his secondary school experience, his expectations about how the role of the teacher is performed are firmly rooted in twelve years of informal observation and highly personal conclusion. In order to adopt any new methods or skills of instruction not congruent with those already held, the prospective teacher must alter those conceptions which, though perhaps distorted, are nevertheless deep-seated. The attitudes acquired from earlier roles may be in direct conflict with the specialized role expectations of teaching he meets in a school

(Milne, 1968).

If the university's education program succeeds in reinforcing the student's positive attitudes toward the teaching role with instruction in methods and skill development, the model of teacher behaviour then held by the student should serve him well in the situation he enters as a practising teacher. He will have become aware of a set of methods, information about his subject, and strategies which will allow him to transfer knowledge about art to his students successfully. He may have acquired a modified set of orientations and values with which to approach his task. By the time a beginning teacher faces the expectation of his role he has already, as an individual, developed consistent ways of behaving (Milne, 1968). Again, however, the teacher training institution he enters may not meet his new expectations, so that he finds it difficult to actualize them:

> The individual meets the new value system and feels threatened because it challenges his established, familiar and comfortable values. He does not, of course, necessarily interpret the experience in these terms. He is more likely to see it as a personal conflict, which heightens the intensity of the threat. (Spindler, 1963:158)

The chances of the novice teacher being assimilated easily into his role are reduced by his tendency, as any person in a crisis situation, to revert to stereotypic, rigid behaviour patterns which would inhibit objectivity and receptivity to change. His belief system, to whatever extent incongruent with the actual situation, has been challenged. To restore the novice's sense of equilibrium, that belief system must be altered to a realistic perception of the structure of the institution.

> Such alteration functions as a way of enabling the young teacher to adapt to the environment in which he works, and adaptation, as we all know, is one of the skills necessary for survival. (Eisner, 1972:14)

Those who find it impossible to meet the challenge to alter their beliefs become casualties of this "professional socialization."

The beginning teacher of art ought to be equipped with a firm rationale for art education. He should be able to satisfy the expectations he brings regarding curriculum implementation. He must be firmly convinced of the value of art as an educational activity; the confusions and contradictions within the values and rationales for the teaching of art must be resolved to his satisfaction or his ability to maintain a meaningful program will be jeopardized (Lanier, 1972).

> There has been a disillusionment of practising artist-teachers, between the art education theory and actual practise that has been their verbal pressure for change. Both beginning art teachers and career art teachers have been questioning the gap between pedagogical theory and classroom situations. (Geiss, 1972:10)

Coupled with the need for fulfilment of curricular expectations is the need for adequate facilities:

> The quality of the program is often measured by the quality of the art teacher, but the best teachers cannot implement or generate a quality program in which facilities are inadequate, materials are lacking, supplies are scarce, and equipment is in need of repair. (Hatfield, 1972:21)

This aspect of art education is one of the direct sources of frustration to many teachers in the field. Obviously, very few school systems will have the resources to supply optimum facilities for every school's art area, but the teacher who finds himself in a situation without supplies and equipment, and with little expectation of receiving them, has severe limitations placed upon his projected program.

These limitations could be alleviated with the help of an enlightened and co-operative administration. If, however, the expectation of the young art teacher is that his subject will be seen as essential by the school's administrators, he may be confused by a lack of understanding displayed by those in authority about the needs and peculiarities of the art program. Junior high schools may be particularly conspicuous in this regard:

> A teaching schedule of seven forty-five minute periods per day, five days a week is not uncommon for the public school art teacher. Inadequate supplies, large classes, and unsympathetic administrators are also realities for many art teachers. (Jefferson, 1972:16)

The discrepancies between the ideals of administrative co-operation held by the art teacher and the actualities of budgetary, timetable, class-size, and facility concessions may be difficult to accept; may even be unbearable. The work load of the beginning teacher is, in most school systems, no lighter than that of his more experienced colleagues:

> In fact, the beginner often gets the difficult situation which the older teacher avoids. Such policies make professional survival difficult and for many impossible. (Stinnet, 1972:6)

The task of convincing school executives that art is essential and that certain considerations must be given to that program may create dissatisfaction for the art teacher. The same types of frustrations occur when the art teacher encounters misunderstandings from his fellow teachers about his role and program. They, too, bring certain conceptions, from their own school experience, of what an art program is like and may have a poorly informed view of what goes on in the art room.

The students themselves have expectations from previous encounters with art, which may tend to frustrate the art teacher. If his content or method of instruction differs from that of their previous experience, they may resist the learning tasks developed by that teacher.

> If his students come to believe, as a function of their previous experience, that art is trivial in the sense that little concerted effort or work needs to go into "art activities," it will be difficult for a teacher to develop changes in conception and expectation. (Eisner, 1972:14)

The number and magnitude of discrepancies perceived by the art teacher are likely to affect directly his adjustment to the role. If the implementation of his program ideas can be done with a minimum of complication, he is more likely to find satisfaction in his role and be more positive in promoting innovation and change.

> Where the principal instructional objective is survival, experimentation may be unthinkable. Also, newly graduated art educators from higher education certification programs are often unprepared for the harsh realities of the profession much less to change them. The daily frustration, maddening inconsistencies, presumptuous requests, and general hand-to-hand combat with the lot of educational kith and kin turn idealism and energy to exhaustion and disdain. (Vitoria, 1972:18)

> The beginning teacher's feeling of threat overcomes him and he seeks refuge in the shelter of his established values. (Spindler, 1963:159)

In sum, prospective teachers, beginning teachers, and teachers with some years of experience in the classroom have in common the problem of conducting programs from which as many obstacles as possible have been eliminated or modified to tolerable proportions. The assumption that each of these groups has a set of priorities specific to that group gives legitimacy to an attempt to describe what these might be, and to ascertain to what extent they may be realizable within a school system.

An examination of the discontinuities most frequently perceived by prospective teachers, beginning teachers, and experienced teachers of art could be of assistance to policy decision-makers, both in university education faculties and in school systems. The description of such situations could be helpful both in planning programs of instruction for art education, and for school administrators who wish to stabilize personnel requirements.

> Future art teachers need to explore the idea of why they have a place in the schools. They need to be clear about what teachers should know; what they should teach; and what significance their program of instruction should have in the education of students. They need this information in order to do their work satisfactorily. They need it as a means of protecting themselves against their critics. But above all, they need it for their own peace of mind. (Hubbard, 1967; in Hatfield, 1972:23)

This study should provide practical information for decision-makers in art teacher-training institutions, and for those in administrative positions who influence the regulation of art teaching situations. It should also serve to inform professional art teachers' organizations about the teaching conditions experienced by their colleagues.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was conducted only with secondary art education students and art teachers at the secondary level; no elementary art teachers were included. Only those teachers who had received training at the Universities of Alberta and Calgary during the last ten years were included. Teachers who received art education training at other universities and who were practising in Alberta were excluded, as were any teachers who left the province after receiving training at the two above-named institutions.

The decision to include a category for prospective teachers created certain problems, which had to be weighed against the advantage of being able to see whether the expectations gathered by students from practicum experiences were realized when they were given their own classrooms. Obviously, prospective teachers could offer only the most sketchy responses to some questions, while the biases of their student-teaching experiences probably affected how they responded to other items. Nevertheless, their attitudes towards what they perceived to be the teaching situation provided an interesting extra dimension to the study, and while their contributions must be accepted with caution, they are worth including in the body of this thesis.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

A wide range of philosophies of art education exists among the teachers of the province, caused by variations in studio background, interest, and routes of training. This variation may have limited the generalizability of the findings. It is also important to note that there may or may not have been a causal relationship between the factors of facilities, administrative and curricular expectations, and the discontinuities experienced as the subjects moved through their teaching careers.

Limitations common to all questionnaire approaches were present, particularly the problem of response acquiescence. A precaution was taken in an attempt to reduce this problem by providing an equal number of positively and negatively worded items. The final limitation was that imposed by the necessity of limiting the study to a one-year period. In order to enhance commonality among sub-groups, it was deemed desirable to conduct the study at the point in time when every group was at the completion of a term or year.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

This literature review focusses primarily on the attitudes of art teachers as they are affected by the circumstances surrounding their training and early teaching experience. Motives of prospective art teachers, training of prospective art teachers, expectations for effectiveness placed upon art teachers in the school situation, and factors which contribute to that effectiveness (or lack of it) are examined.

Teacher preparation, career satisfaction, and attitude factors in teaching have all been identified as topics pertinent to the general teaching field. The specific area of teacher attitude in art education, however, is one in which little documented research is available. Problems have been isolated by researchers, but few have suggested practical means of alleviating them.

The following review cites considerations about teacher motivations, attitudes, effectiveness, and role perception which are applicable to any aspect of the teaching experience, including art. It emphasizes the particularities of the art situation and attempts to dwell on the considerations which apply most specifically to the realm of the art teacher. The review examines the art teaching situation in hope of identifying specific proposals for improving conditions in the field. The two main areas surveyed comprise teacher preparation programs in the arts, and conditions in the public schools and other institutions in which art teachers are employed.

The literature which discusses the motivating factors of prospective art teachers and their subsequent training and experience reveals little evidence of actual research. Most authors have written in general terms, their opinions and observations being the basis for the writings cited in this literature review. They have expressed strong views and suggested sweeping changes, but in no instance have these proposed innovations or reorganizations been supported by research data. The opinions and observations of these authors are, however, valuable because they represent the views of experienced art educators.

MOTIVATING FACTORS FOR PROSPECTIVE ART TEACHERS

Possible reasons for entering the field of art teaching could be listed indefinitely, but a search of the literature reveals that while many observers of art education credit prospective art teachers with positive motives for choosing teaching as a career, several writers are suspicious of the motives of would-be artists who turn to teaching as a secondary alternative. If such a practice prevails, it merits examination in this study.

No systematic investigation has ever been conducted to determine why people become art teachers. Standard accepted reasons include an interest in art, enjoyment of children, or an ambition to contribute something of value to society. Early success with art in school has been cited as a leading factor in attracting potential art teachers. Since many college art graduates turn to teaching, it is reasonable to believe that a substantial proportion of these same people were once numbered among the more successful art students of the high schools (Hubbard, 1967).

Most new teachers have had relatively pleasant experiences as students. If they had not, it is unlikely that they would have been in a position to become teachers (Cooper & Ryan, 1972). Prospective art teachers are motivated partly, then, by a feeling of familiarity with the requirements of the profession and the confidence that feeling gives.

The status of the teaching profession is given as both a positive and negative force in teacher recruitment. The image of teaching has always been a "poor-but-honest" one, appealing to middle-class young people throughout Western history as a rather passive activity enjoyed by those who loved knowledge for its own sake, and avoided by those who sought power or fortune (Cooper & Ryan, 1972; Levy, 1972; Smith, 1969). Unfortunately, this same genteel image can engender negative attitudes in the prospective art teacher towards his professional goals, because it is often stated that the more capable students head for the prestigious and highly remunerative professions, while the less capable or willing student is apt to turn to teaching (Dutton & Keislar, 1961). Often it is said that those who enter teaching are socially ambitious and that they stay with teaching only as long as they can use it as a step to something better (Smith, 1969; Levy, 1972). Both views imply that negative factors are present in the motivation of those intending to teach art.

There is a possibility that some students are attracted to the teaching of art for its connotations of creative behaviour, carried out in an atmosphere where a great deal of freedom is available to the teacher. Since only a very small minority of teachers are art specialists, the art teacher may expect to achieve an image of great individuality by surrounding himself with some of the mystique of the artist (Maul, 1964).

Although not all art teachers begin their university education with plans for professional success as artists, university art departments and art schools are important sources of transfer students to art education programs in this province. It has been mentioned by Hubbard (1967) that students interested in the applied fields of architecture, dress design, commercial art, and industrial design are more likely to be absorbed into professional practice in those specific fields. Areas such as painting, sculpture, graphics, and the artistic crafts, in which commercial application is less likely to offer stable career opportunities, are those from which art teachers are typically drawn. The clarification of art teachers' motivations revealed through investigation in this study could prove illuminating.

Schwartz, Jefferson, Charters, and Beymer have criticized some prospective teachers who enter the profession with motives that are less desirable and could detract from commitment to the teaching profession. Schwartz (1970) stated that the young person who presents himself to an art education department as a prospective teacher tends frequently to have a preponderant interest in developing himself as an artist. It has been pointed out that in the art field, perhaps more than in other areas of educational specialization, the opportunities for employment outside the teaching field are strictly limited. This could be one cause for the criticism levelled at art specialists that they enter the teaching field with a greater interest in their own work, seeking opportunities to preserve their own artistic development (Schwartz, 1970).

Schwartz was, however, presenting only part of the picture in claiming that it necessarily follows that an individual who is interested in developing his own artistic abilities may not be committed to his teaching role. A counter argument could be that a teacher who fails to keep an active interest in his studies is seriously limiting his professional growth and, thus, is in danger of presenting a stale view of the arts to his students.

Jefferson (1972) added other less admirable reasons: " . . . security, a desire to be in art but not seriously, and parental pressures" (p. 16). However, Smith (1969) commented that individuals who enter teaching with ulterior motives are unlikely to remain in the teaching field. Schwartz (1965) displayed a more optimistic attitude, noting that such individuals may in time become much involved and discover important values that they previously did not realize existed.

None of these writers mentioned that one underlying motive may be economic. Such a consideration could force an individual to remain in teaching for several years, though dissatisfaction and frustration have caused him to desire a change in career. Engel (1976) had sharp criticism for those artists who "accept teaching positions despite their resentment that this is a necessary but humiliating task, in order to provide an income" (p. 5).

Commitment to the teaching field is affected by such differing motives as those just discussed, and also by the ease with which one can enter the teaching profession, said Cooper and Ryan (1972). They pointed out that the decision to become a teacher is frequently casual and unexamined, a statement accompanied, however, by little conclusive proof. When compared to other professions (architecture, medicine), the entrance requirements to a career in teaching are relatively low. With fewer pressures and less sacrifice of time and effort to consider, the decision to become a teacher may be made with little serious deliberation. Thus, people may differ greatly in their commitment to a career in art education. Charters (1963) argued that research will establish whether or not such commitments are discernible among young students prior to their entry to teacher training and whether or not the commitments are predictive of professional longevity. Schwartz (1970) felt that there are special characteristic demands of the field of art education which require that such a decision "should probably be considered even more carefully than any other art career decision" (p. 46). This statement implies that the teaching of art is both mysterious and challenging.

The sincerity and commitment of each individual's decision to enter art education is a factor known only to the candidate himself. However, the art teacher training institution also has an obligation, which is to screen candidates for such qualities of commitment and interest as can be determined by them (Beymer, 1970). The National Art Education Association (N.A.E.A.) Committee on Professional Standards (1970) stated:

> A. Recruitment and selection of teacher candidates in art education should receive continuing attention. Candidates should be individually screened and selected by the art education faculty in addition to meeting the institution's usual standards for admission. A continuing program of screening and evaluation should assure that only qualified candidates are continued in preparation programs and that students develop professional goals and attitudes.
>
> 1. At every level of admission of students into the art education program, the total goals and potentials of the individual should be assessed. (1970:11)

Several authors cited later in the text listed desired traits for the prospective art teacher; however, while offering some criteria which were more specific than those previously mentioned, they did not show any consensus of priorities, nor did they suggest any practical means of carrying out this constant screening process on such a heterogeneous group as is usually found in any population of art teaching candidates.

In summary, the factors most often given as motivating prospective art teachers are: early success in school experience; the attraction of a respected professional status; lack of practical alternative career choices for art school graduates; the use of teaching as a "stepping-stone" in career development; and economic considerations. The literature indicated a general feeling that candidates for teacher training in art education must be screened for their degree of sincerity and commitment to the teaching role. All these factors have differing implications for the prospective art teacher's expectations and hopes for success in his chosen career.

THE PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF THE ART TEACHER

Art education experts, not unexpectedly, differ in their opinions of what is important in the training of an art teacher. Their priorities range from an emphasis on the subject matter of art with art-related skill and knowledge to a strong emphasis on general pedagogical competence. These views, representing a continuum from teacher as practising artist to teacher as efficient classroom manager, are described and analysed in this section.

All those who discuss art teacher training seem to agree that the modern approach to art education with its wide-ranging goals, broad conception of curriculum, and more active image of the teacher's responsibilities, has crucial implications for the preparation of art teachers (Eisner, 1972). Intense study of the concerns of art teachers, both prospective and practising, is also required.

In recent years, many experts on art and education have levelled criticism at the preparation of art teachers, calling such education in American universities "unwieldy, unrealistic and stultifying" (Kuh, 1968; in Engel, 1976:4). Engel also stated that:

> It has become an accepted part of the "insiders" educational folk-wisdom that the art teachers are insufficiently equipped to perform in their intended profession. They are educationally short-changed throughout their own education. (1976:4-5)

Some particular areas of competence required for art teachers have been repeated frequently in the literature. An overview of these produced the following listing of desired traits (Levy, 1972; Schwartz, 1970; McFee, 1961; N.A.E.A., 1970):

1. A general background in contemporary culture, psychology and human development, the humanities and art history.
2. Extensive studio experience in a wide variety of areas.

3. The educational awareness needed to make informed judgements about the students and their work.

4. The ability to guide children into creative experiences.

Cooper and Ryan (1972) gave their criteria for a well-trained teacher as follows:

> 1. Command of theoretical knowledge about learning and human behaviour.
> 2. Control of technical skills of teaching which facilitate student learning.
> 3. Display of attitudes which foster learning and genuine human relationships.
> 4. Sureness and adequacy of knowledge in the subject matter to be taught. (p. 185)

Of those who hold subject matter competence in highest regard, probably the most extreme view has been exemplified by David C. Levy (1972), dean of the Parsons School of Design in New York. He declared that a creative approach to teaching art is developed through intensive studio training which he felt art education majors do not receive. Levy was convinced that, in a substantial number of cases, the professional artist or designer is far more qualified to teach high school art than is the duly certified teacher. While this may be true in terms of pure subject matter, a belief that teacher-training programs serve a useful purpose elicits the response that there is a certain skill required to present this information in a way that communicates it best to students. This belief in teaching skill gives validity to the existence of teacher-training institutions.

Levy's view has been closely supported by that of Elizabeth Geiss (1972), who said that teacher training programs in the arts must develop highly qualified artists and must schedule in-depth innovative experiences in arts teaching. However, Geiss has effectively avoided stating to which proponent of art teaching she would give priority: the qualified professional artist or the skilled educator. She has advocated developing a highly talented core of professionals, stating her priorities for art teacher training to be: (1) the art educator must be an artist; and (2) the art educator must be an excellent teacher (1972:10). These ideals are, of course, optimum expectations to be advocated by anyone with the best interests of art education in mind (Geiss, 1972).

In-depth study in art has been advocated by Smitheram, et al. (1971), because the secondary teacher must work effectively with older students whose psychological readiness enables them to cope with the logic of a discipline, and whose ability to do research, independent study, and some critical analysis is beginning to emerge. Some would argue that in-depth study is also necessary for those who would teach the early grades, as they feel that specialists in the subject matter of art could be utilized effectively in all grades, to the benefit of art education in general.

Other authors have expressed the opinion that the ability to produce art is important, but that, in itself, is not enough (Beymer, 1970; Vitoria, 1972). Engel (1976) has accused those who train art teachers of failing to provide the aspirant with such basic skills as systematic organization and planning, and clear expression and communication in oral and written forms. These authors saw art education as having equal priorities of knowledge of subject area and a good range of instructional strategies and techniques. Any such list of requirements is so ideal as to bring agreement from any recruiter of art teachers. What these platitudinous statements of basic requirement factors lack is a glimpse at the personality requirements felt necessary by these experts for success in teaching.

Some other critics of current art education programs argued that prospective art teachers have been provided with too little training in teaching skills, and lack the realistic practical knowledge that will enable them to manage an art room effectively (Schwartz, 1970; Jefferson, 1972; Cooper & Ryan, 1972). Most of these critics laid the blame for lack of practical skills in art teaching graduates on student teaching programs, which they criticized as ineffectual because they do not allow the student to familiarize himself with the skills he will need (Geiss, 1972; Beymer, 1970). Engel (1976) demanded that aspiring art teachers be equally well-prepared in both subject matter and teaching skills:

> The preparation of a teacher demands a double thrust, each necessary, but only both sufficient. Teachers must develop general pedagogical skills . . . but it is not enough. Teachers must have something to teach. (1976:5)

The dichotomy of opinion on emphasis in art teacher training is evident from the previous quotations: strong arguments have been presented both for subject matter emphasis and an emphasis on teaching skills. It is interesting to note that this dichotomy is manifest in the training system of Alberta art teachers. Two distinct routes are offered to those who wish to teach art: a student can spend several years in a fine arts program and follow that with the minimal required courses to qualify for an Alberta Teaching Certificate, or the years of preparation may be spent in an education program which includes several courses in the area of art specialization.

It has been frequently stated that student teaching practices are too brief and artificial (Milne, 1968). Education programs have been less often critized for not presenting student teachers with a realistic picture of the teaching situation and the blame for many educational ills has rested on this circumstance. It is simple enough to state that more extensive student teaching would make better teachers: there are few tasks that are not performed with improved skill by those who have had the greatest amount of practice. The question emerges: at what point does the student-teacher role cease to provide a useful learning situation? Research is required to determine an optimum amount of practicum for teaching in art.

One author has gone so far as to insist that increased student-teaching experience would substantially diminish the major ills of art education:

> If art teachers were better educated, the other obstacles of funds, and lack of art values on the part of the community and administration, would be lessened. (Beymer, 1970:37)

Beymer's statement is questionable. It is doubtful that the problems she cited could be solved so easily. However, most art teacher education theorists seem to agree that student teaching is a very important phase in the development of the art teacher. Schwartz (1970) recognized the critical nature of the student teaching experience and specified that student teaching must be supervised by someone who is an involved, helpful, and knowledgeable "master-teacher" who will encourage and inspire the new art teacher: "At this critical juncture it is the art teachers in the school who bear the responsibility for furthering the professional development of the student" (p. 38).

The concept of a "master teacher" is sound in theory. The problem arises in finding a sufficient supply of such excellent and inspirational teachers who are also willing to contribute their time to the training of new colleagues. A training program for these "co-operating" teachers would also greatly improve the process of teacher-training in art, though nowhere in the literature is it suggested that some uniform quality of supervision for student-teacher programs could be derived from such a plan. The N.A.E.A. (1970), in its "Guidelines for Teacher Preparation," has presented a seven-point list of requirements for practicum-student teaching and internship, which specified such considerations as: the needs and personality of the art teacher in assigning the student teaching situation and co-operating teacher; full levels of responsibility and control; adequate supervision by qualified college personnel; co-operation and involvement by co-operating teachers in implementation and improvement of the student teaching program; a wide range of teaching duties made available to the student teacher. Unlike previously quoted sources, this seems to offer some practical direction for improvement of student teaching.

In-service training has been advocated by education experts (Hannam, 1976; Schwartz, 1970; Cooper & Ryan, 1972) as a means of augmenting the art teacher's preparation once he is in a "field" situation. The case for intensive on-going training was argued by Fuller, Schwartz, Eisner, and Hannam. Fuller (1968) said there is a possibility that many of the beginning education majors are not prepared to benefit from education courses when they have not experienced real problems and real situations. It is a vicious circle, for, perhaps without some experience in teaching, students lack the background and comprehension that would equip them with the capacity to absorb the educational insights presented by professors (Schwartz, 1970). Eisner (1972) also noted that institutions such as schools tend to socialize professionally those who work within them, altering their behaviour and views. This has implications for the development of systematic programs of training to help teachers learn while in the actual institutional setting. A substantial amount of follow-up supervision and training is needed in the first few years to help the beginning teacher consolidate his learnings from the pre-service phase (Hannam, 1976). Schwartz (1965) added:

> It is obvious that the whole job of producing an art teacher cannot be done in the four years of undergraduate preparation . . . but with teaching experiences and attendant years of study past the baccalaureate, art teacher training continues. (p. 37)

Finally, another serious but little considered factor in the education of a prospective teacher is the problem of prior experience. As discussed earlier, all prospective teachers have one thing in common: they have had years of previous experience in schools (Eisner, 1972; Smith, 1969; Cooper & Ryan, 1972). Thus, many of the prospective teacher's conceptions of teaching and its skills are learned in the classrooms of their own school days and, if they are to develop new instructional skills, they must set aside deeply rooted ideas and attitudes (Eisner, 1972). Cooper and Ryan (1972) expressed a similar view:

> A college student contemplating a career in teaching usually has far too much data at his disposal; in other words, he has been

> over-exposed to teachers and schools. . . . Schools, he thinks, can hold no more surprises for him. (p. 136)

Training of prospective teachers must bring an awareness of the many aspects of the school as an institution which were never evident to them when they were students themselves.

To summarize, it is apparent that a controversy exists between the advocates of emphasis on art subject matter competence and those who emphasized the teaching skills as most important in the training of an art teacher. Many writers have deplored the state of art teacher preparation, calling it idealistic and impractical. Several of these writers have suggested that the new teacher approaches his task armed with expectations gleaned from his own middle-class school experiences and that those expectations are entirely incongruent with the diverse actualities of many teaching situations. Most writers have agreed that student-teaching experiences are inadequate and many have advocated in-service training as a means of helping beginning teachers to adjust to their new situations.

INITIAL AND LONG-TERM ADJUSTMENTS FOR THE ART TEACHER

The art teacher's commitment to his chosen profession is largely determined by his attitude towards it as a career (Cooper & Ryan, 1972). Several aspects of the training of an art teacher affecting this attitude have been discussed previously. Another aspect of attitude development in beginning art teachers is the process of psychological adjustment to the teaching role which they encounter as novice teachers. This process has been discussed with regard to teacher training; several critics of art teacher training programs have stressed the need for extensive pre-service training to give the student a clear and realistic picture of what his future professional life will be (Smith, 1969; Cooper & Ryan, 1972; Knoblock & Goldstein, 1971). Neufeld (1971), in his study of the attitudes and open-mindedness of student teachers towards their prospective careers, stated that these factors were determinants of the ability of prospective teachers to dovetail their training and experience into the educational climate of the school. An emotionally well-adjusted person is not only a better, more effective teacher but he gains greater satisfaction from his career involvement (Combs, 1965). This concept has implications for any study of survival factors in the teaching profession. Cooper and Ryan (1972), Smith (1969), and Neufeld (1971) drew upon research which demonstrated that attitudes were vital factors in the success of beginning teachers. However, the majority of authors who mentioned factors of adjustment and success in beginning teachers expressed views which were philosophical in nature rather than observations of test cases or research situations.

Personality is considered a vital factor in the total makeup of a teacher. Most writers declared that the effectiveness of a teacher is dependent upon his personality (Smith, 1969), and when desirable qualities were listed, they usually included many personal qualities. Smith believed that the nebulous concept of personality can be too easily used to explain away problems and failures in early teaching experiences. He felt there is widespread belief that a person who knows his subject matter can learn to teach from a minimal training period because teaching is thought to be basically an expression of personality. Those who have the correct personal styles will succeed, while those who lack the necessary qualities will fail. Smith (1969) and others (Cooper & Ryan, 1972; Peck, 1962) contended that the personal qualities necessary for someone to be a good teacher can be taught, or at least developed through the teacher training program, and should be given as much attention as subject area background, teaching methods, and philosophical bases of education. Surely these personal qualities may be attended to in hopes of preventing candidates personally unsuited to art education from entering a career situation which would prove frustrating and unrewarding.

> Any program of teacher preparation should help a prospective teacher with his personality problems, because these may, and often do, prevent the teacher from interacting effectively with pupils, peers, parents, and other members of the community. (Smith, 1969:83)

"Personality" was defined by Smith (1969) as a summary description of the person's total ways of behaving. He said each individual possesses an "internal frame of reference" which evaluates the self in terms of qualities such as adequacy and ability. Defence systems resulting from negative evaluations of self (common in the inexperienced teacher) can influence teaching behaviour. He combined style of behaviour, the defence systems, and the internal frame of reference into a total phenomenon called personality (Smith, 1969:82)

Beymer (1972) discussed the selection of good prospective teachers of art and cited several essential qualities of personality: openness, imagination, spontaneity, and sensitivity to student needs. Flexibility and adaptability to change were two further characteristics of importance given by her and supported by Combs (1965). Combs also discussed the teacher's self-image, requiring a good teacher to have feelings of adequacy, worthiness, and a sense of being able to cope with events as they happen--a positive self-perception. These are all qualities which are difficult to recognize in an individual until that person has had an opportunity to experience the total classroom situation. Hamacheck (in Beymer, 1965) delved deeper into the psychological makeup of a well-adjusted teacher, advancing a model from which the demand for power or authority were absent. His ideal teacher has rid himself of novice anxieties which would tend to reduce him from the master of his class to its mechanic. The ideal teacher has never existed, however, and these subjective qualities could be interpreted in as many different ways as there are evaluators of teaching in art. As an individual teacher's self-evaluative processes and personal frame of reference approach reality, his adjustment to the task expected of him will increase and more adequate self-management will occur. Not one of these critics of teaching behavior would deny that this adjustment requires time and experience; it cannot be taught by lecture or seminar method; further, its potential cannot unequivocally be recognized in a candidate for art teacher preparation.

Beginning teachers are commonly overwhelmed by their responsibilities in the school setting. Initial exposure can bring on a kind of culture shock which manifests itself in depressions, exhaustion, ill-temper, and serious feelings of self-doubt. These signs of physical and mental stress have been described by Estelle Fuchs (1969), an educational anthropologist:

> . . . the symptoms expressed by beginning teachers go far beyond the ordinary fatigue associated with a new mode of employment. They are surprisingly similar to the phenomenon described by anthropologists as "culture shock"--the feeling of dislocation people experience when they encounter a foreign culture. (p. 21)

Anxieties and attitudes are interrelated in their effect on teacher behaviour. Attitudes have been described by Cooper and Ryan (1972) as a fundamental dimension of personality, predisposing a person to act in a positive or negative way towards persons, ideas, or events. They have isolated four categories of attitude affecting teacher behaviour:

(1) the teacher's attitude toward himself
(2) the teacher's attitude toward children and his relationship to them
(3) the teacher's attitude toward peers and parents
(4) the teacher's attitude toward subject matter (1972:197)

In the literature, specific attitudes have not been empirically related to teaching effectiveness, but most educators are convinced of their importance in the process of teacher adjustment.

Many studies have dealt with the anxieties of beginning teachers. The beginning teacher may have unpleasant feelings and attitudes which he does not wish to face in himself. Insecurity and feelings of inadequacy are normal for a teacher facing a class for the first time. The need for approval from pupils and peers is usually very strong. The new teacher does not know his limitations; he cannot anticipate the outcomes of certain situations nor reactions to his attempts to deal with them. Confusion and aggression arise. When problems and failures occur in the first year, the beginning teacher has no backlog of successful teaching on which to reflect or from which to draw encouragement. The reward system in a school is negligible. If a beginning teacher experiences little positive feedback he may develop a disproportionately negative self-perception. Internalization of these feelings could lead to feelings of inferiority and a negative attitude towards teaching (Knoblock & Goldstein, 1971).

It is essential, then, that the teacher establish clear communications with the other adults in his school. In the case of the art teacher, the mystique surrounding his subject can lead to further communication breakdown due to the lack of understanding, on the part of other staff members, of art objectives and processes (Schwartz, 1970; Hubbard, 1967). Working with children all day, the teacher feels a need to break through the teacher-isolation barrier and find validation for his endeavours in the responses of fellow professionals. The need to feel competent and included in the teacher-learning community is at the core of the teacher's need system, according to Knoblock and Goldstein (1971). This need is related to the need to communicate with other adults. Additional emotional needs of teachers observed by those authors may be summarized as follows:

> A need for time for self-renewal activity away from the constant barrage of stimuli, incidents and situations of a crisis nature encountered every day by school staffs
>
> A need to obtain validation from peers and administrators
>
> A need for assistance and support in effecting changes
>
> A need to share ideas and theories with other teachers (Knoblock & Goldstein, 1971)

Knoblock and Goldstein (1971) presented these points in arguing that the needs of the adults in the school community, as well as those of the children, should be considered. This seems to be a reasonable demand if teachers are to present to their students a stable and consistent presentation of themselves.

The major concerns of the beginning teacher can be summarized as follows (Fuller, 1968; Milne, 1968; Smith, 1969):

Difficulty in maintaining discipline
Ignorance of expections of fellow teachers and administrators
Inadequate equipment
Subject-matter inadequacy
Lack of confidence in planning abilities
Concern about pupils' reaction to the beginning teacher
Concern over meeting standards of teacher conduct
Fears about attitudes of parents
Concerns about job placement
Concerns about differences in social backgrounds between teacher and child

Failure to satisfy these concerns and meet these needs can also contribute to the feeling of failure and inadequacy that exists among beginning teachers. Taken in total, these problem areas are the sources for anxieties which affect teaching performance and teachers' attitudes towards their chosen career.

Fuller (1968), in a study observing the developmental concerns of prospective and beginning teachers, has isolated three phases which coincide with the groups of teachers examined in the present study: a pre-teaching phase, an early-teaching phase, and a late-teaching phase. Briefly, they can be summarized as follows:

1. The pre-teaching phase (one of non-concern); the

prospective teacher in his early years of teacher-training has few real concerns about teaching. He thinks of teaching in terms of his own experiences as a pupil and is vague and misinformed about problems he expects to encounter.

2. The early-teaching phase (one of concern with self): the teacher is mainly concerned with his own adequacies and his abilities to handle students and cope with classes.
3. The late-teaching phase: "mature" concerns seem to focus on pupil gain and teacher self-evaluation rather than on personal gain and evaluation by administration. Specific characteristics include a teacher's ability to understand his pupils' capacities, assess their gains, and evaluate himself in terms of pupil gains.

The contemporary observer of art teaching situations might readily admit that this ideal state is beyond the reach of most beginning teachers in art. If art teachers are to deal confidently with the processes involved in their initiation into the professional world, their concerns must be heeded. They must also be given the capabilities through training, equipment, and support, and through supervisors, to enable them to grapple with these difficulties.

Taken overall, personality emerges as a vital factor in the success of the teacher, but many authors agreed that personal qualities necessary for a well-adjusted teacher could be developed, if not necessarily taught, by a thorough training program. To enable the beginning teacher to cope with anxieties and stresses presented by the new situation, the following traits are apparently necessary--flexibility, adaptability, and a positive self-image. Attitude factors affecting teacher behaviour include attitude toward self, toward children and relationships with children, toward peers and parents, and attitude toward the subject being taught. Support and acceptance from administration and fellow teachers were said to contribute to the new teacher's successful adjustment to teaching. Three phases of teacher adjustment were explained: the pre-teaching phase of non-concern; the early-teaching phase of concern with self and his own abilities to cope with new demands; and the late-teaching phase of concern with pupil development and constructive evaluation of self.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ART TEACHER AND THE SCHOOL AS A SOCIAL SYSTEM

The problem of attrition due to dissatisfaction among new teachers has been researched, and some statistics (for example, Stinnet, 1972) showed that up to 50% of those teachers who actually entered school situations left the profession before ten years of service, most in their first five years. It has been stated that few teachers quit because they do not like teaching; factors intrinsic to the school system may diminish the holding power of the profession (Stinnet, 1972). Those considerations are presented in this section. A review of the available literature again revealed little in the specific area of art teachers' satisfaction with working conditions, although much information and analysis are available as they touch upon general education. Some particular considerations discussed below, however, seem relevant to the special situation encountered by the art teacher.

Cooper and Ryan (1972) found that 12% of all teachers left the field each year. They acknowledged that not all people are temperamentally suited to teaching or interested in a lifetime career as a teacher. They also pointed out that many teachers who are happy with teaching may have plans to stay in the profession only three or four years and then pursue another career. These people could probably be encouraged to stay if circumstances were made more agreeable. The dropout rate may not be completely attributable to teacher dissatisfaction, but it is still a serious problem in the school systems.

Although the routines of school life are familiar to the new teacher, there is much about school life that cannot be fully appreciated by the novice taking over a full teaching position. Beginning teachers are surprised at the amount of administrative and clerical work required of them. The amount of preparation time and the amount of physical and emotional energy required of them are further shocking realizations (Cooper & Ryan, 1972).

The fact that new teachers must learn to cope with most situations by a process of trial-and-error, having been presented with the same amount of responsibility and workload as a much more experienced colleague, has been sharply criticized by teacher preparation experts (Stinnet, 1972; Cooper & Ryan, 1972; Smith, 1969). The discouragement which results may well cause many teachers to leave the field each year.

A related problem and one equally as serious is that of teacher assignments. Typically, the beginning teacher is given the poorest choice of classes and a heavier teaching load than experienced teachers on a staff because of the seniority ladder in large school systems

Knoblock and Goldstein (1971) found a relationship between the "difficulty" of the school in which a teacher is employed and the teacher's plans to keep teaching. They stated that this should be of great interest to administrators since it has often been said that the high rate of turnover in the teaching profession is, in fact, the result of a tendency to assign beginning teachers to the most difficult schools. Schwartz (1965) commented that the first year of teaching is critical, and that unsound, unprofessional assignment practices by some boards of education lose good teachers for school systems. He may be right; but there remains the problem of urgent teacher needs in problem situations, which leave school boards with little choice but to fill these positions with the most readily available teachers--often new recruits and inexperienced persons who cannot afford to discriminate about job possibilities. An unfortunate situation arises when an administrator is placed in a position with little alternative but to choose the least suited but most available candidate for such a position.

A report of the Alberta Teachers' Association on opinions of principals on the first-year experience of teachers prepared in Alberta universities was published in 1973. Although not restricted to art teachers, the findings are applicable to first-year art teachers. Among weaknesses in first-year teachers observed by principals, the most common was "poor discipline," and two related weaknesses, "weak organizational ability and planning," and "difficulty in adjusting to or understanding the needs of students." This seems to indicate that more emphasis should be placed upon development of these skills, both during the pre-professional training period and the novice period of teaching.

There is an urgent need for support from administration and experienced staff members during the beginning years of the art teacher's career (Smith, 1969; Stinnet, 1972; Cooper & Ryan, 1972). Many of these teachers' hopes for success will also depend on administrator conceptions of the role of art in education (Hubbard, 1967). Hatfield (1972) was even more definite in his view of the importance of administrative approval and support: "Success is realized only when the administrator begins to gain insight into the real values of art . . ." (p. 23). This statement implied that administrators have only to undergo some long awaited revelation to the true value of art in the school program. It seems more realistic to expect that the administration might be made more aware of the pragmatic needs of the art teacher.

Correlated with the role of the administrator in facilitating a satisfactory situation for the art teacher are those of the rest of the teaching staff. If the latter view the art program as essential, enjoying equal status with their own subjects, the art teacher is likely to enjoy a greater degree of success. Schwartz (1970) suggested that art teachers must perform a sort of "missionary role" to make a little understood subject more important in schools. Hatfield (1972) supported this statement by saying that art teachers must develop the socio-political skills to convince other teachers, school executives, and board members that art is essential. Hatfield (1972) pointed out that "for years neither art teachers nor art programs have enjoyed the status in the schools which the academic subjects have held" (p. 23).

Levy (1972) discussed the status of art programs in the schools and said that the new teacher is challenged to learn to fight for his program and defend its position in the overall curriculum. The other members of the staff may see the art teacher as a competitor or an ally, depending upon their feelings about the art program in relation to their own subject area. Hubbard (1967) declared that some teachers of the more firmly established subjects may be mildly disdainful of the art teacher and his subject. Others may resent the intrusion of art into the curriculum "core."

Budget considerations are one area where art teachers must be wary of resentment from other members of the teaching staff. Both Hubbard (1967) and Hatfield (1972) discussed the question of budgetting for art facilities, noting that it requires an informed approach to administration and fellow staff members, as the area is a potential source of friction if the needs of an art program cannot be justified. Hatfield (1972) further stated that it is unfortunate that "art educators have had little or no emphasis on budget preparation in art during our education and that there is a dearth of assistance from the literature of the field" (p. 21). However, other more militant writers insisted that the art teacher has a duty to press for increased budget allocations and facilities for his subject. Vitoria (1972) argued that:

> By accepting substandard conditions, art educators are tacitly endorsing second-class teacherships, with all their accompanying hardships. Administrators who provide and make mandatory such conditions are irresponsibly contributing to and reinforcing an already dangerously low national level of aesthetic deprivation. (p. 18)

Vitoria's statement seems extreme. To suggest that administrators are "reinforcing an already dangerously low national level of aesthetic deprivation," one would first have to explain the very vague term "aesthetic deprivation." Also, administrators cannot be held personally responsible for circumstances dictated as much by budgetary considerations as by aesthetic priorities. The N.A.E.A. (1967; in Hatfield, 1972) made a more conservative statement about the same problem:

> The effectiveness of the art program is directly related to the quality of the environment within which the program operates. While it is true that certain objectives of a program may be achieved even with less than adequate time, materials, facilities, and personnel, more often than not the results are less adequate. (p. 21)

The art teacher's responsibility for clean-up and maintaining art facilities and equipment can be an added strain upon the beginning teacher. Janitorial activities undoubtedly deplete teacher energies, re-directing educational skills to "sub-educational functioning" (Schwartz, 1970). Schwartz voiced a concern about the amount of art teachers' time consumed by ancillary chores, suggesting that it would be worthwhile to investigate the proportion of the art specialist's time and efforts spent on non-teaching functions (1970). The literature of art education does not contain much information about teacher involvement in non-teaching activities; but in the art area, particularly, it must be considerable. Habitually, administrators expect custodial responsibilities from art teachers. The art teacher's effectiveness is judged, partially at least, by the order and cleanliness of his room and equipment. Schwartz (1970) and Hubbard (1967) agreed that educational ideals and energies should be devoted to art learning if art is to be regarded as a serious subject. For art teachers to accept these custodial expectations as their lot is insupportable, according to these sources. The beginning teacher seems particularly vulnerable to problems in this regard because he has not established a routine and a set of priorities to enable him to function easily within the expectations of the administration. This seems to be a fundamental source of problems between the art teacher and the school system, and one which could cause serious frustration for the art specialist who enters an art teaching situation unaware of his covert functions as stock clerk, custodian, accountant, and purchasing agent which often take precedence --in the eyes of his superiors--over his actual art teaching function. Ideally, every art teacher might have an assistant to maintain supplies, handle equipment, and ensure order within the workroom. Requests for such assistance, though logical and justifiable, are not likely to be fulfilled in the near future in any publicly funded school system.

A further source of discouragement and frustration to the idealistic art teacher is the calibre of students who make up his classes. Dorn (1972) and Levy (1972) both deplored the use of art classes as a "dumping ground" for "academically backward" students, discipline problems, and students with little academic initiative. Both have suggested that the situation of required art classes at lower secondary school levels populates those classes with students who are not always motivated by an interest in art or a willingness to learn. They said that this situation militates against inspired and successful art teaching and can be a source of discouragement to the art teacher. This problem, though a serious one, is not confined to art. Any subject experiences similar difficulties, although those outside the core probably suffer most severely.

The final source of problems between art teacher and school, discussed here, is the expectation that the art teacher will fulfil any need of the school requiring artistic judgement and the facilities of the art room. Setting up exhibits, decorations and scenery, and poster-making are examples of services the art teacher may be asked to perform. Hubbard (1967) cautioned that the art teacher must consider carefully the amount of time he is willing to commit to these activities, and to determine where such tasks begin to infringe upon the execution of his art program, his energies, and his private life. A difficult situation may arise if the art teacher must utilize art program time to fulfil obligations he has undertaken for the purpose of good public relations for the art department.

The foregoing material may lead to the conclusion that the art teacher's relationship with the school as a social system has a direct bearing on his decision to remain in teaching. Several factors have been given as crucial to the dropout rate of art teachers. Discouragement can occur because new teachers are forced to cope primarily through trial-and-error in the first years of teaching. Authors have stated a need for assistance from the administration and approval and support from fellow staff members. The assignment of new teachers to difficult teaching situations has been cited as a strong factor in causing teachers to leave the profession. Added to this were the often-mentioned problems typical of art-teaching situations: low status of art in schools; poor calibre of students registered in art courses; inadequate facilities; and added pressure of ancillary chores unrelated to the actual teaching process.

CURRICULAR CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE ART TEACHER

Philosophical considerations can affect the teacher's attitude towards his teaching position and his satisfaction in that position. The congruence of his philosophy of art education with the total curricular mode of the school is essential to ensure implementation of a workable program which suits all the participants: teachers, students, administrators, and community members. The best efforts of a teacher-training faculty are likely to have little impact unless the school structure in which the young teacher of art works supports the conceptions and skills that he or she learned in the university setting (Eisner, 1972).

Cooper and Ryan (1972) admitted that schools cannot successfully incorporate diverse philosophies in their curricula. They explained that if a certain philosophy is dominant within a given community, the curriculum of its schools is likely to reflect that set of beliefs, and those who do not agree will remain dissatisfied. They described a basic example of differing curricular priorities as follows:

> If one considers the school's primary objective to be the intellectual training of students, any curriculum which does not emphasize scholarship will be considered irrelevant. Conversely, if one believes that the school should emphasize the development of the "whole child"--his emotional and social, as well as intellectual growth--curriculum devoted exclusively to history, English, the sciences, mathematics and foreign languages will be considered inappropriate for many students and thus irrelevant. (1972:106)

A study conducted by Miller and Hodgson (1953) at the University of Alberta considered factors which determine success and failure among beginning teachers. The problem mentioned most frequently was the beginning teacher's adjustment of his philosophy to existing conditions in the school (Miller & Hodgson, 1953). Though their study is now twenty-five years old, no visible changes appear to have taken place to make it less relevant than it was in 1953.

Art program implementation is a vulnerable area for conflicts in curriculum rationale between art teachers and the school as a whole. Day (1972) suggested a reason for this may be that art teachers, unlike teachers of most other subjects, are usually wholly responsible for curriculum development (organization, instruction, and evaluation) in their subject. In art, specified textbooks or prescribed, prepared, sequential curricula are not often used, so the teacher's own rationale for art teaching becomes an important component of the curriculum development. In reflecting upon the autonomy of art programs, Day pointed out that, in art, divergence, individuality of expression, and creativity are valued and sought after.

Day (1972) also suggested that it is possible that different teaching situations might strongly suggest the use of different rationales. Both Day (1972) and Thelen (1971) have developed categories of rationales for art education programs. Day's categories are concerned with art teachers' reasons for teaching art (Day Art Rationale Assessment Instrument) and deal mainly with differing interpretations of art as a field of study. His nine categories include:

(a) The fostering of creativity through studio art activities
(b) Providing students with competencies and attitudes to promote art as a leisure-time activity
(c) Integrating student's personality, releasing tensions, and expressing inner feeling
(d) Increasing student's knowledge and appreciation of great art
(e) Providing visual education for future environmental understanding
(f) Transmitting cultural heritage

(g) Cultivating respect for intuitive and subjective thinking
(h) Training of visual aesthetic sensibilities (1972:20)

Thelen's (1971) categories seem to deal mainly with the teacher's approach to student learning as it applies to the subject matter of art. His six varieties of art education may be described as: (a) technique shaping; (b) appreciation shaping; (c) personality releasing as self-esteem; (d) personality releasing as competence; (e) communication; and (f) social action. Thelen's categories are provided as a grid for evaluating art programs, but any art teacher's approach is likely to be described more by one category than another.

The two instruments indicate the vast field of possible teaching strategies in art to which any individual may subscribe. The teacher who feels that his rationale for teaching art is in harmony with the school and community in which he works would be in an excellent position to bring students, other teachers, and parents to realize that art learning has a vital place in their lives. Conversely, it seems that it would be difficult for a teacher who had come to identify with a certain set of art teaching beliefs and rationales either to work comfortably within a school situation of opposing or incongruent rationale and policy, or to adjust his basic philosophy of art education to concur with the system of the school in which he is to operate. So, it seems that this problem of curricular considerations could be an additional source of dissatisfaction and attitude change among art teachers.

Eisner (1972) has argued that adaptation of rationale is possible, and entirely necessary. He cited an example of a teacher who had completed an art education training program believing that he should encourage in-depth, uninterrupted work with art materials among his students. The teacher carried his beliefs into a school situation where the timetable consisted of 40-minute periods, or where curricular expectations of the school compelled him to "move the class, en bloc, from project to project" (1972:14). Eisner called this situation "institutional press" and suggested that the teacher should alter his pedagogical methods and beliefs to the structure of the institution's organization.

In summary, the authors reviewed in this section have suggested strongly that the teacher of art would experience the greatest success and satisfaction in a school situation if his philosophy of curriculum were congruent with that of the school. The art teacher's concept of art curriculum must be flexible enough to adjust to the demands of the school's program, or he will experience severe frustration in trying to establish his own priorities despite the limitations set out by the school. Day (1972) has explained nine different types of art-teaching rationales amenable to different teaching situations, ranging from "fostering creativity through studio activities" and "releasing tensions, expressing inner feeling" to "transmitting cultural heritage" and "training of visual aesthetic sensibilities" (p. 20). Thelen (1971) has described the categories he observed as different art teachers' approaches to student learning, and listed six varieties, from an emphasis on "technique shaping" to a concern with "social action."

It was stressed throughout the literature that teaching rationale is an important aspect of the teacher's relationship with the school in which he works, and one which must be similar to that of the school so as to allow the teacher to adapt, function, and survive. This suggests that a search for factors related to teacher turnover should investigate whether incongruity between a teacher's philosophy of teaching and the school's philosophy is a significant factor.

SOCIETAL INFLUENCES ON THE ART TEACHING SITUATION

The value structure of the art teacher has a strong influence on his choice of rationale for art teaching, and it also affects his concept of his role as an art teacher. It is important to examine where these values originate and how they serve the art teacher in his position as educator. It is also important to examine society's expectations of the art teacher. The importance of these expectations to this study lie in their effect on teacher satisfaction and attitude towards the art teaching profession.

The art teacher gains a conception of his role through a variety of sources: his experiences as a pupil, his experience on the job, his reading, exchange of views, reflection, and, of course, his professional training (Musgrove and Taylor, 1969). His particular role concept will be shaped significantly by his total social philosophy and his attitudes towards himself as an individual. Schwartz (1970) used these factors to explain that, while teacher training can do a great deal to influence the prospective art teacher's views concerning art teaching, the primary influence modifying the art teacher's role-concept is the pre-conditioning of his early development.

Eisner (1972) claimed that it is very difficult for a young teacher to adjust his concept of the role he expects to fulfil when he is confronted with a school situation fundamentally different from the one he has been trained to expect. His original "conceptions and skills must be drastically modified because of the role expections, institutional press, and other forms of professional socialization . . ." (Eisner, 1972:14). The role expectations of students and faculty colleagues upon the teacher may interfere with his ability to adjust to a new situation.

Eisner (1972) suggested that there are contradictions between values in training programs and values in schools, which produce serious discontinuities in role concept for the novice teacher. An obvious source of discontinuity was pointed out by Smith (1969:11): the recruitment of teachers and students for teacher training institutions is primarily from middle-income populations. Discrepancies become serious when these graduates enter another segment of society whose values are different.

Spindler (1965) offered some solution to the discontinuities encountered by teachers, suggesting that one aim for teacher training should be:

> . . . to create in the teacher an awareness of how his culture influences what he does as a teacher and how his students' culture influences what they do and how to think about, observe, and analyse these influences. (p. 156)

Fuchs (1969) concurred, stating that rapid change in values, beliefs, and attitudes in our society has made essential an understanding of cultural patterns and social pressures as they affect the schools and the people working in them. Understanding the school as a social system will help teachers understand the expectation and value systems confronting them (Joyce and Weil, 1972).

These authors have noted the nature and seriousness of the discontinuities which exist, but have failed to indicate a vital factor: it is very difficult to transmit "understanding," particularly to those young and inexperienced teacher-candidates who populate university methods courses. Perhaps this is why so many authors have pointed out discrepancies without offering practical resolutions.

Several writers have deplored the image of art in North American society as it reflects on art education. Baumgartner (1967; in Beymer, 1970:37) cited the lack of value of art in the eyes of the general public as being one of the greatest barriers to art education. Levy (1972:9) said that art is not respectable in our schools and communities --especially not for men. He deplored the disinterest of communities in the development of art curricula in the schools. He also claimed that parents exhibit an "apparent horror at the prospect of their children becoming artists" (p. 9). Schwartz (1970) adopted a more moderate position, stating that most communities view art as a token of life's "niceties" rather than an important means of individual development. He offered the hope, however, that more enlightened parents do desire better art learning opportunities for their children.

All writers seemed to agree that the communities exert a strong influence on the acceptance of art as a viable subject area in the schools, on its objectives, and on the services it offers the community. Schwartz (1970) stated that, as yet, the communities are not upset by the small amount of art taught in the schools, and that no great changes in the status of art as a subject will take place until awareness evolves. The literature revealed a feeling of futility about the possibility of art teachers themselves facilitating this awareness from within the schools. Sociologists perceived that few major changes arise from within the public education system; rather, changes which occur in the schools are largely a response to changes in society. Such a feeling does not provide much hope for proselytizing on the part of the art teacher, who finds enough difficulty in communicating and illustrating the importance of his subject to the limited audience of his students, their parents, or his superiors.

The values of an art teacher are shaped significantly by his own school experiences, and he may be called upon to question these, once in an actual teaching situation. Some writers insisted that contradictions exist between the values of training programs and those which exist in the schools, creating discontinuities and conflicting role concepts for the new teacher. It has been suggested that an understanding of the expectations and value systems awaiting the teacher-trainee should be developed by the training institutions. The prospective art teacher has been nurtured in a situation where art has been valued very highly. Courses and training in a specialized art area indoctrinate the student-teacher of art with a feeling that art is a priority item in education. His experiences in the schools and communities, declared the art educators, will cause discouragement for the novice art teacher because society has not yet placed art in a position of great importance in school curricula.

SUMMARY

A review of recent literature in the art education field has yielded a mixture of prescription for and criticism of art teacher-training programs and institutions. Many suggestions have been offered for changes within the school system, which might make better use of these highly trained individuals.

A general concern for the interests of candidates in art education was exhibited in the literature. Various authors have felt that these people should be screened for motivating factors and commitment to the teaching profession, to prevent disappointment and waste of effort on the parts of both candidate and training institution and, ultimately, to prevent those who are unsuited for the art teaching role from entering the profession. No actual descriptions of possible screening methods were found in the literature.

It was acknowledged that many difficult adjustments must be made between teacher training and actual teaching situations. Many experts described personal qualities required in a teacher to enable him to overcome early teaching anxieties and stresses: flexibility, adaptability, and a positive self-image were cited as being the most common personal qualities necessary. Some writers also described the supporting roles of administrators and other teachers in the adjustment period of the new teacher, describing positive first-year experiences as crucial to the teacher's success.

The art teacher's position in the school hierarchy could be a source of discouragement for the novice, according to many experts;

the status of art in the curriculum, inadequate facilities, and poor calibre of students are listed as sources of frustration in many school situations.

The art teacher should be prepared to adjust his priorities and philosophy of curriculum to suit that of the school in which he is operating. According to two art educators, Day (1972) and Thelen (1971), there are many differing rationales for art teaching and art learning among art educators, all valid, but some more suitable than others in particular teaching situations. The onus is upon the art teacher to examine his own values and to arrive at a concept of his role by trying to understand the expectations society is placing on him. Reconciliation of discontinuities permits the art teacher to function within a given situation. Little hope has been displayed for the kind of support all art educators would like to see for the arts in school curricula, yet the art teacher is expected to try to foster an awareness of the importance of art in education.

Chapter 3

DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

Two questions were investigated in this study:

1. How are some of the important matters affecting art teachers' well-being perceived by prospective teachers, beginning teachers, and experienced teachers?
2. May these differences in perception be attributable to
    (a) length of experience of the art teacher?
    (b) percentage of art taught by the art teacher?
    (c) The institution attended for teacher training in art?

A description of the matters most frequently perceived as affecting the art teacher's well-being was the object of the first question.

Three null hypotheses were formulated from the second question:

H_o1 There are no significant differences between three groups of art teachers (prospective, beginning, and experienced teachers) in their perceptions of matters affecting art teachers' well-being.

H_o2 There are no significant differences between teachers engaged in teaching art for differing percentages of time, in their perceptions of matters affecting art teachers' well-being.

H_o3 There are no significant differences between art teachers who have graduated from the two major teacher training institutions in Alberta, in their perceptions of matters affecting art teachers' well-being.

SUBJECTS

The subjects surveyed were placed in three different categories: prospective teachers, novice or beginning teachers, and experienced or veteran teachers. This method of grouping seemed to coincide with the three phases of teacher adjustment outlined in the literature.

All respondents had received training in art education at the University of Alberta or the University of Calgary and all stated that their major field of teacher training had been art education.

Prospective teachers included all those students involved in senior curriculum and instruction courses in secondary art education at the two universities, and had completed student teaching requirements.

Practising teachers, in novice teacher and experienced teacher categories, comprised samples of teachers of secondary art programs who were graduates of art education courses at the Universities of Calgary and Alberta, and whose major field of teacher training was art education.

It is understood that the generalizability of the findings in this study may be limited, due to the individual nature of the responses. Each teacher or prospective teacher had a singular set of values and perceptions about his experiences and situation. Further, the population sample was recognized to be small, relative to the number of teachers of art in the province.

DESIGN OF THE INSTRUMENT AND DATA COLLECTION

To obtain information required for this study, a questionnaire consisting of fifty items was designed (see Appendix A). The items were categorized under the following three sections:

1. Section A - The Working Environment
   Items pertaining to facilities and career expectations
2. Section B - The Human Elements
   Items dealing with interaction with administrators, colleagues, students, and parents
3. Section C - Curricular Considerations
   Items pertaining to curricular expectations

Before the questionnaire was distributed, a pilot study was conducted, using five senior art education students who wrote critical analyses of the questionnaire from the viewpoint of prospective teachers. The suggestions elicited by this sample resulted in some minor revisions in the questionnaire before its distribution.

The same questionnaire was administered to all groups under examination. The researcher presented an explanation and instructions to classes of prospective art teachers surveyed at the Universities of Calgary and Alberta, and requested them to answer items according to how they perceived the art teaching role through their experiences as student teachers.

To survey the practising teachers of art, a mail survey was employed. Questionnaires, each accompanied by a letter of introduction (see Appendix B) and a stamped, self-addressed envelope, were sent to art teachers through a variety of channels during May and June, 1976.

To screen the respondents for university attended, degree held, major field of teacher training, percentage of art taught, and number of years teaching experience, the letter of introduction contained a group of questions to which prospective subjects were asked to respond. The respondents were not required to give their names but were asked to identify the university where their teacher training took place, degrees held, number of years teaching experience, and percentage of art in their timetables on a scale of 25% or less; 26% to 50%; 51% to 75%; or 76% to 100%.

In the large urban centres of Edmonton and Calgary, distribution of questionnaires was done under the auspices of the Separate and Public School Boards. Edmonton Public and Separate Boards both sent a questionnaire to each junior high school and high school, requesting that it be forwarded to the art teacher. In the case of a school which employed more than one art teacher, it was assumed that the questionnaire was delivered to the senior teaching member of the art department or the person who conducted the greatest number of art classes. The art departments of both the Calgary Public and Separate School Boards supplied the researcher with a list of art teachers who had attended either the University of Calgary or the University of Alberta, thus eliminating the necessity of surveying anyone whose training did not fit the requirements of this study.

The Government of Alberta Department of Education, Fine Arts Department provided a listing of teachers of art in the remaining schools of the province, and from this a list of ninety schools was derived to which questionnaires were sent. Criteria for choosing each school for this list were: (1) it formed one of a group comprising all high schools in the province, other than those in Edmonton or Calgary; and (2) its total enrolment was more than 200 students and its curriculum included secondary art classes. It was hoped that this selection system would provide the study with as many art education graduates as possible throughout the province.

A total of 239 subjects was surveyed, including 39 prospective teachers and 200 practising art teachers. The questionnaires were mailed during June, 1976, and it is possible that this time of year could have affected the rate of return as well as the attitude of some of the respondents toward the questionnaire. By August 25, 1976, 120 completed questionnaires were returned to the researcher of which 71 were selected as useful for analysis. The remaining 49 were eliminated because the respondents had not attended either of the two stated universities, or their major field of teacher training was a subject other than art (see Table 1).

Completed questionnaires were received from the following groups:

1. Prospective teachers at the University of Alberta
2. Prospective teachers at the University of Calgary
3. Practising teachers who graduated from art education programs at the University of Alberta
4. Practising teachers who graduated from art education programs at the University of Calgary
5. Other art teachers who graduated from art education

programs at universities other than those included in this study

6. Other art teachers who were currently teaching art but did not give art education as their major field of teaching training

TABLE 1

SAMPLE SELECTION

Questionnaire Allocation	Prospective Teachers	Practising Teachers	Total
Distributed	39	200	239
Returned	39	120	159
Included in sample	39	71	110
(Percentage of returns)	(100)	(59.16)	(69.18)
Rejected for sample	0	49	49
(a) respondents unsuitable	0	41	41
(b) questionnaires incomplete	0	8	8

The readjusted sample total, after discounting those respondents who were not applicable, was 110. The findings of the study were based on a return of 110 of 159, or 69.18% of the art teachers who completed the questionnaire.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

INTRODUCTION

Data were assembled to give a comparison of the responses of the three groups of arts teachers: (1) prospective art teachers who had completed student teaching experiences but had not yet taken over full classroom responsibilities; (2) beginning teachers who were in their first or second years of teaching; and (3) experienced teachers who had taught two or more years. They also provided a comparison between teachers who had very little art in their timetables with those who conducted art for greater percentages of their total classroom time. In addition, a comparison was made between the responses of teachers from two institutions teaching art education: the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary. Tabulated data and a discussion of responses to items in the three sections dealing with facilities, curriculum implementation, and the roles of the administration, colleagues, students, and parents are presented in relation to the questions under investigation.

DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

Completed questionnaires accepted for analysis yielded specific information on the make-up of the sub-groups. Details are presented below (see Table 2).

5

TABLE 2

DESCRIPTION OF RESPONDENTS

	Prospective	Beginning (1-2 yrs.)	Experienced	Totals
Total No. in sample	39 (35.5%)	21 (19.1%)	50 (45.5%)	110
University of Alberta	26 (66.7%)	7 (33.3%)	28 (56.0%)	61
University of Calgary	13 (33.3%)	14 (66.7%)	22 (44.0%)	49
0 - 25% art classes	N/A	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0
26 - 50% art classes	N/A	1 (04.8%)	5 (10.0%)	6
51 - 75% art classes	N/A	4 (19.0%)	8 (16.0%)	12
76 - 100% art classes	N/A	16 (76.2%)	37 (74.0%)	53

Prospective Teachers

Of the 110 respondents, 39 (35.5%) were prospective teachers. Twenty-six (66.7%) of the 39 were trained at the University of Alberta, while 13 (33.3%) of them received their art education training at the University of Calgary.

Beginning Teachers (1-2 yrs. teaching experience)

Of the 110 respondents, 21 (19.1%) were beginning teachers. Seven (33.3%) of the 21 received their art teacher training at the University of Alberta, and 14 (66.7%) of them were trained at the University of Calgary. None of these beginning teachers taught less than 26% art in their timetable. One of the 21 (4.8%) gave the amount of art in his timetable as between 26% and 50%; four (19.0%) indicated between 51% and 75% art; and 16 (76.2%) indicated between 76% and 100%.

Experienced Teachers (more than 2 yrs. teaching experience)

Of the 110 respondents, 50 (45.5%) were categorized as experienced teachers. Of the 50, 28 (56.0%) were trained in art education at the University of Alberta, and 22 (44.0%) at the University of Calgary. None of these teachers indicated that their timetable consisted of less than 26% art. Five (10.0%) stated that art comprised between 26% and 50% of their timetable, while 8 (16%) stated that between 51% and 75% of their timetable was allocated to art classes. Thirty-seven (74.0%) of them taught art for periods encompassing 76% to 100% of their timetables.

Respondents from the University of Alberta

Of the total respondents, 61 (55.5%) stated they had received their art education training at the University of Alberta. This number included 26 (23.6%) student teachers, 7 (6.4%) beginning teachers, and 28 (25.5%) experienced teachers. Of the practising teacher graduates from the University of Alberta, 4 (3.6%) stated their art teaching load was between 26% and 50%; 6 (5.5%) gave between 51% and 75%; and 25 (22.7%) of them gave their art teaching load as between 76% and 100%.

Respondents from the University of Calgary

Of the total 110 respondents, 49 (44.5%) said they received their art education training at the University of Calgary. This number included 13 (11.8%) student teachers; 14 (12.7%) beginning teachers; and 22 (20.0%) experienced teachers. Of this group, 2 (1.8%) gave their art teaching load as between 26% and 50% of their timetable; 6 (5.5%) gave between 51% and 75%; 28 (25.5%) said their art teaching load was between 76% and 100%.

Total Respondents

Of the total of 110 respondents, 39 (35.5%) were student teachers; 21 (19.1%) were beginning teachers; and 50 (45.5%) were experienced teachers. Sixty-one (55.5%) took their art teacher training at the University of Alberta, while 49 (44.5%) were trained in art education at the University of Calgary. In categories of percentage of art taught, distribution was as follows: student teachers (who had taught no art classes) totalled 39 (35.5%); there were no respondents who taught between 0% and 25% of art in their timetable; those who taught between 26% and 50% art constituted 6 (5.5%) of the total; those who taught between 51% and 75% art were 12 (10.9%) of the total; and those who taught between 76% and 100% art were 53 (48.2%) of the total respondents surveyed.

ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

This section presents, in itemized form, the data obtained from the completed questionnaires and includes commentary on those items which were found to provide differences among the responses. The data have been grouped within three sub-headings: (1) the Working Environment; (2) Human Elements; and (3) Curricular Considerations, and each is dealt with separately.

SECTION A: THE WORKING ENVIRONMENT

The items in this category totalled 16, divided among the subcategories Facilities, Time, Materials, Repairs, and Career Considerations. Each of these items yielded information which is first briefly summarized to give a comprehensive picture of the working environment perceived by the respondents, and then presented in tabulated format.

Facilities (Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 10). Items dealing with Facilities are summarized below.

Item 1. *My art teaching facilities make it possible for me to present all those aspects of the art program that I think are important.*

In most cases, the various groups registered a moderate degree of agreement with this statement. Prospective teachers showed a certain amount of optimism which was reflected in their relatively positive responses. The other notable point was the highly significant differences among percentage levels. The 50% moderate disagreement registered by the group who taught 26% to 50% art may be due to the possibility that these respondents conducted their few art classes in rooms that were not actual art teaching areas (see Table 3).

TABLE 3

ITEM 1
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	16.4	48.2	--	20.9	14.5
Experience Levels					
Prospective	5.1	56.4	--	30.8	7.7*
Beginning	14.3	38.1	--	23.8	23.8
Experienced	26.0	46.0	--	12.0	16.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	5.1	56.4	--	30.8	7.7
26 - 50	16.7	--	--	50.0	33.3*
51 - 75	8.3	50.0	--	25.0	16.7
76 - 100	26.4	47.2	--	9.4	17.0
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	18.0	42.6	--	27.9	11.5
U. of Calgary	14.3	55.1	--	12.2	18.4

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

Item 2. *My art area does not have adequate size for efficient work.*

Though responses were distributed right across the scale, indicating a wide variation in art area sizes, there was general agreement among the total sample that art areas are not large enough for efficient work. When the data from the experience level groups were examined, highly significant differences were apparent which seemed to suggest that, while beginning teachers strongly agreed that their art areas were not large enough, no consensus was reached by the experienced teachers. One might conjecture that the more experienced teachers tended to be rewarded with those teaching situations containing the most favourable working conditions. Among percentage levels, highly significant differences occurred. Strong agreement with the statement by those teaching 26% to 50% art may indicate that they were teaching art in areas not specifically designated to be art rooms, and therefore were inadequate for art purposes (Table 4).

Item 3. *My art area has sufficient lighting for work.*

Although significant differences were reported for this item among experience levels and percentage levels, analysis revealed that these stemmed from differences between prospective teachers' responses and those of practising teachers. Since practising teachers agreed that lighting was not a problem, one can probably attribute the variety of response to experiental rather than substantive differences (Table 5).

Item 6. *My storage areas are not sufficient for my purposes.*

In general, all samples tended to see a problem with storage areas. In every case, a majority of respondents agreed moderately or strongly that storage areas were not sufficient for the art teacher's purposes (Table 6).

TABLE 4

ITEM 2
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	28.2	30.0	2.7	18.2	20.9
Experience Levels					
Prospective	15.4	53.8	2.6	17.9	10.3*
Beginning	57.1	9.5	—	14.3	19.0
Experienced	26.0	20.0	4.0	20.0	30.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	15.4	53.8	2.6	17.9	10.3*
26 - 50	33.3	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7
51 - 75	16.7	33.3	8.3	25.0	16.7
76 - 100	39.6	13.2	—	17.0	30.2
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	23.0	36.1	4.9	14.8	21.3
U. of Calgary	34.7	22.4	—	22.4	20.4

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

TABLE 5

ITEM 3
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	37.3	42.7	0.9	11.8	7.3
Experience Levels					
Prospective	20.5	48.7	--	25.6	5.1*
Beginning	42.9	33.3	4.8	9.5	9.5
Experienced	48.0	42.0	--	2.0	8.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	20.5	48.7	--	25.6	5.1
26 - 50	50.0	33.3	--	--	16.7*
51 - 75	16.7	83.3	--	--	--
76 - 100	52.8	30.2	1.9	5.7	9.4
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	37.7	49.2	--	9.8	3.3
U. of Calgary	36.7	34.7	2.0	14.3	12.2

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

TABLE 6

ITEM 6
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	3.27	38.2	1.8	17.3	10.0
Experience Levels					
Prospective	28.2	46.2	5.1	17.9	2.6
Beginning	47.6	14.3	--	23.8	14.3
Experienced	30.0	42.0	--	14.0	14.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	28.2	46.2	5.1	17.9	2.6
26 - 50	50.0	16.7	--	16.7	16.7
51 - 75	33.3	50.0	--	--	16.7
76 - 100	34.0	32.1	--	20.8	13.2
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	27.9	44.3	1.6	18.0	8.2
U. of Calgary	38.8	30.6	2.0	16.3	12.2

Item 10. *I have adequate clean-up facilities.*

Variations in response among practising teachers to this item implied two possibilities: (1) either variations existed among individuals in the standards they had for clean-up, or (2) great differences existed among clean-up facilities found in art areas of schools throughout the province (Table 7).

TABLE 7

ITEM 10
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	14.5	33.6	7.3	22.7	21.8
Experience Levels					
Prospective	5.1	46.2	10.3	28.2	10.3
Beginning	23.8	19.0	9.5	23.8	23.8
Experienced	18.0	30.0	4.0	18.0	30.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	5.1	46.2	10.3	28.2	10.3
26 - 50	33.3	16.7	16.7	--	33.3
51 - 75	8.3	33.3	--	16.7	41.7
76 - 100	20.8	26.4	5.7	22.6	24.5
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	16.4	34.4	8.2	21.3	19.7
U. of Calgary	12.2	32.7	6.1	24.5	24.5

Time considerations (Items 4, 8). Items dealing with the time considerations affecting art teachers are summarized below.

Item 4. *I do not have sufficient teacher preparation time to enable me to have a smoothly running art program.*

The high percentage of moderate agreement with Item 4 among the total sample suggests that many of the teachers surveyed perceived their preparation time as insufficient for the needs of their art programs. A comparison of experience levels, percentage levels, and university groups showed no significant differences between the groups in any comparison (Table 8).

Item 8. *Class time is not long enough to ensure adequate working and clean-up time.*

Inconclusive results were gained from the total sample's varied responses to Item 8. A comparison of experience levels yielded agreement on the part of prospective teachers and disagreement on the part of experienced teachers. This disagreement may have indicated that they did not perceive the length of class times as a problem, or that they had created situations for themselves where they did not meet time problems. A significant difference was found between the two university groups in their responses to Item 8 (Table 9).

Materials (Items 5, 9, 11). Items dealing with materials included Nos. 5, 9, and 11. Tabulations and commentary on these are presented below.

Item 5. *There is little problem with students who waste materials.*

Of all teachers surveyed, a significant number perceived a

TABLE 8

ITEM 4
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	21.8	39.1	4.5	21.8	12.7
Experience Levels					
Prospective	28.2	30.8	2.6	15.4	5.5
Beginning	9.5	42.9	9.5	23.8	14.3
Experienced	22.0	44.0	4.0	20.0	10.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	28.2	30.8	2.6	23.1	15.4
26 - 50	50.0	16.7	--	33.3	--
51 - 75	8.3	50.0	--	33.3	8.3
76 - 100	17.0	45.3	7.5	17.0	13.2
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	27.9	36.1	1.6	23.0	11.5
U. of Calgary	14.3	42.9	8.2	20.4	14.3

TABLE 9

ITEM 8
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	28.2	18.2	8.2	23.6	21.8
Experience Levels					
Prospective	38.5	25.6	7.7	20.5	7.7
Beginning	28.6	14.3	9.5	19.0	28.6
Experienced	20.0	14.0	8.0	28.0	30.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	38.5	25.6	7.7	20.5	7.7
26 - 50	33.3	16.7	16.7	--	33.3
51 - 75	--	8.3	8.3	50.0	33.3
76 - 100	26.4	15.1	7.5	22.6	28.3
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	18.0	24.6	11.5	24.6	21.3
U. of Calgary	40.8	10.2	4.1	22.4	22.4*

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

problem with students who wasted materials. Of experience levels, beginning teachers gave the strongest negative response to the statement. A significant difference was found in Item 5 between the respondent groups from the two universities (Table 10).

TABLE 10

ITEM 5
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	7.3	22.7	1.8	40.9	27.3
Experience Levels					
Prospective	10.3	17.9	2.6	46.2	23.1
Beginning	4.8	19.0	--	23.8	52.4
Experienced	6.0	28.0	2.0	44.0	20.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	10.3	17.9	2.6	46.2	23.1
26 - 50	--	16.7	--	50.0	33.3
51 - 75	--	33.3	--	25.0	41.7
76 - 100	7.5	24.5	1.9	39.6	26.4
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	4.9	14.8	--	49.2	31.1
U. of Calgary	10.2	32.7	4.1	30.6	22.4 *

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

Item 9. *I find it difficult to maintain a stock of supplies on the budget given.*

The distribution of the total sample responses reflected no strong general trend and therefore may have indicated a wide variation in either budget allotments to art teachers or budget expectations from art teachers. However, more than half the respondents did agree their allotted budgets made it difficult to maintain a stock of supplies. No significant differences were found between either experience level groups or percentage level groups (Table 11).

TABLE 11

ITEM 9
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	27.3	29.1	4.5	24.5	14.5
Experience Levels					
Prospective	25.6	41.0	5.1	23.1	5.1
Beginning	33.3	19.0	4.8	28.6	14.3
Experienced	26.0	24.0	4.0	24.0	22.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	25.6	41.0	5.1	23.1	5.1
26 - 50	16.7	33.3	16.7	33.3	--
51 - 75	41.7	--	--	41.7	16.7
76 - 100	26.4	26.4	3.8	20.8	22.6
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	24.6	29.5	6.6	27.9	11.5
U. of Calgary	30.6	28.6	2.0	20.4	18.4

Item 11. *I find it difficult to get students to bring materials from home.*

Strong to moderate agreement was registered by all groups, showing that most teachers perceived this aspect of art teaching as difficult. Again, beginning teachers seemed to perceive the most serious difficulty in this regard (Table 12).

TABLE 12

ITEM 11
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	46.4	32.7	4.5	15.5	0.9
Experience Levels					
Prospective	30.8	41.0	2.6	23.1	2.6
Beginning	66.7	28.6	4.8	--	--
Experienced	50.0	28.0	6.0	16.0	--
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	30.8	41.0	2.6	23.1	2.6
26 - 50	66.7	33.3	--	--	--
51 - 75	66.7	8.3	8.3	16.7	--
76 - 100	50.9	32.1	5.7	11.3	--
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	45.9	36.1	4.9	13.1	--
U. of Calgary	46.9	28.6	4.1	18.4	2.0

Repairs (Item 7)

Item 7. *I receive little co-operation when my art area needs repairs or renovations.*

Results on this item suggested a variety of perceptions of the support available for repairs and renovations to art rooms. This variation occurred over the total group and continued over experience levels and percentage levels of art taught. All groups in each comparison were distributed in similar ways between agreement and disagreement, so that no significant differences were noted between groups (Table 13).

TABLE 13

ITEM 7
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	15.5	27.3	8.2	32.7	16.4
Experience Levels					
Prospective	17.9	30.8	12.8	33.3	5.1
Beginning	14.3	38.1	4.8	33.3	9.5
Experienced	14.0	20.0	6.0	32.0	28.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	17.9	30.8	12.8	33.3	5.1
26 - 50	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.7	16.7
51 - 75	25.0	25.0	8.3	33.3	8.3
76 - 100	11.3	24.5	3.8	34.0	26.4
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	13.1	26.2	4.9	37.7	18.0
U. of Calgary	18.4	28.6	12.2	26.5	14.3

Career considerations (Items 12, 13, 14, 15, 16). Items dealing with the art teacher's career considerations are summarized below.

Item 12. *I expect to remain at the same school for several years.*

Teachers indicated their general intention to stay in a school for several years. It is noteworthy, however, that 21.8% of the total responses were neutral, showing that teachers' future plans were not settled. Similar results were noted in comparisons between experience levels and percentage levels, and no significant differences were found (Table 14).

Item 13. *I chose art education as a field because of my love of art.*

All groups registered strong agreement with this statement, showing strong support for the idea that they were motivated to become art teachers by a love of the subject (Table 15).

Item 14. *I chose art education as a field because of my love of children.*

Moderate agreement was the response given by 45% of the total sample to Item 14. This response was in strong contrast to the universally strong agreement with Item 13, " . . . because of my love of art." Love of art seemed to be a much stronger motivating factor for art education than love of children. No significant differences occurred between the comparison groups on this item (Table 16).

Item 15. *I feel my lack of experience creates special problems during my first years of teaching.*

When the total sample was analysed, 44% were found to be in

TABLE 14

ITEM 12
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	16.4	31.8	21.8	14.5	15.5
Experience Levels					
Prospective	10.3	25.6	20.5	25.6	17.9
Beginning	9.5	42.9	19.0	9.5	19.0
Experienced	24.0	32.0	24.0	8.0	12.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	10.3	25.6	20.5	25.6	17.9
26 - 50	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	--
51 - 75	8.3	33.3	8.3	8.3	41.7
76 - 100	20.8	35.8	26.4	7.5	9.4
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	16.4	31.1	21.3	16.4	14.8
U. of Calgary	16.3	32.7	22.4	12.2	16.3

TABLE 15

ITEM 13
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	73.4	22.9	0.9	1.8	0.9
Experience Levels					
Prospective	71.7	26.3	--	2.6	--
Beginning	81.0	19.0	--	--	--
Experienced	72.0	22.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	71.1	26.3	--	2.6	--
26 - 50	66.7	16.7	--	16.7	--
51 - 75	83.3	16.7	--	--	--
76 - 100	73.6	22.6	1.9	--	1.9
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	75.4	21.3	--	3.3	--
U. of Calgary	70.8	25.0	2.1	--	2.1

TABLE 16

ITEM 14
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	21.1	45.0	12.8	15.6	5.5
Experience Levels					
Prospective	21.1	50.0	10.5	13.2	5.3
Beginning	9.5	61.9	9.5	14.3	4.8
Experienced	26.0	34.0	16.0	18.0	6.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	21.1	50.0	10.5	13.2	5.3
26 - 50	--	33.3	33.3	33.3	--
51 - 75	16.7	50.0	--	16.7	16.7
76 - 100	24.5	41.5	15.1	15.1	3.8
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	26.2	37.7	16.4	16.4	3.3
U. of Calgary	14.6	54.2	8.3	14.6	8.3

moderate agreement with this statement, indicating a general agreement that lack of experience creates problems for beginning teachers. However, there were significant differences in perception of this aspect of art teacher well-being among both experience level groups and percentage level groups. Prospective and beginning teachers perceived their inexperience as a source of problems, while experienced teachers, remembering their beginning years, did not appear to perceive their inexperience as such a great source of difficulty. Among percentage levels, the trend moved from agreement in prospective teachers and those with 26% to 50% art to an ambiguous response of partial, moderate agreement and partial, strong disagreement from those teachers with 76% to 100% art in their timetables.

A significant difference was noted between the two university groups in response to Item 15. University of Alberta-trained respondents were categorized as in moderate to strong agreement, while University of Calgary-trained art teachers gave both agreement and disagreement (Table 17).

Item 16.. *If another career in art had been available to me, I would have pursued it rather than teaching.*

The general trend on this item was towards disagreement, indicating that most respondents would have chosen art teaching over another career in art. However, the large percentage of neutral responses also appeared to show that some art teachers were less than strongly committed to the profession (Table 18).

TABLE 17

ITEM 15
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	18.3	44.0	9.2	13.8	15.7
Experience Levels					
Prospective	34.2	47.4	5.3	10.5	2.6
Beginning	19.0	47.6	4.8	19.0	9.5*
Experienced	6.0	40.0	14.0	14.0	26.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	34.2	47.4	5.3	10.5	2.6
26 - 50	16.7	66.7	16.7	--	--
51 - 75	--	50.0	16.7	8.3	* 25.0
76 - 100	11.3	37.7	9.4	18.9	22.6
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	27.9	50.8	6.6	6.6	8.2
U. of Calgary	6.3	35.4	12.5	22.9	* 22.9

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

TABLE 18

ITEM 16
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	11.0	18.3	22.0	34.9	13.8
Experience Levels					
Prospective	13.2	13.2	18.4	39.5	15.8
Beginning	9.5	4.8	23.8	52.4	9.5
Experienced	10.0	28.0	24.0	24.0	14.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	13.2	13.2	18.4	39.5	15.8
26 - 50	33.3	16.7	33.3	16.7	--
51 - 75	16.7	16.7	16.7	33.3	16.7
76 - 100	5.7	22.6	24.5	34.0	13.2
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	6.6	21.3	24.6	37.7	9.8
U. of Calgary	16.7	14.6	18.8	31.3	18.8

SUMMARY OF SECTION A: THE WORKING ENVIRONMENT

Total Responses

Several items in Section A received noteworthy responses from the total sample. The items dealing with facilities revealed some inconsistencies in the way art teachers perceived their art teaching facilities. Teachers responding to the general statement, "My art teaching facilities make it possible for me to present all those aspects of the art program that I think are important" (Item 1) brought a high level of moderate agreement. In contrast, more specific statements elicited more negative assessments of facilities. "My art area does not have adequate size for efficient work" (Item 2) brought an ambiguous, indefinite response distributed across the scale, which probably was an indication of the great differences in size existing among art rooms. "My storage areas are not sufficient for my purposes" (Item 6) revealed moderate to strong agreement, showing definite dissatisfaction in this regard.

General agreement was registered for the statements that art areas had sufficient lighting and adequate clean-up facilities.

Those items pertaining to time considerations revealed that preparation time was perceived as insufficient by the general sample. Wide variations in class scheduling were presumed to be the cause of inconclusive trends in response to the statement that class time was inadequate to ensure sufficient working and clean-up time.

Teachers indicated perception of a set of common problems in their responses to items dealing with materials. They disagreed that there was little problem with students who waste materials, with very strong support that it was difficult to get students to bring materials from home. They were divided on the subject of adequacy of given budgets, though the trend indicated a feeling that it was difficult to maintain a stock of supplies within available budgets. Differences in art budget allotments throughout the province could have affected responses to this item. A division of response also occurred on the question of co-operation when repairs and renovations were needed, again suggesting a wide variety in situations throughout the province.

Career considerations revealed further important responses from the total sample. Moderate agreement occurred most frequently with the statement, "I expect to remain at the same school for several years" (Item 12), though 21.8% of the total sample was neutral, indicating that many teachers had no definite feelings in this regard. Although a high percentage strongly agreed that they chose art education as a field because of a love of art, a significantly lower percentage moderately agreed that their choice was due to a love of children. Moderate agreement with Item 15 revealed that most teachers felt inexperience created special problems for beginning teachers. Moderate disagreement was registered with the statement, "If another career in art had been available to me, I would have pursued it rather than teaching" (Item 16). Again, a large portion of the sample was neutral on this item.

Experience Levels

Significant differences occurred between experience level groups on Items 1, 2, and 3 of the facilities statements. Prospective teachers gave the most positive response to the question of general adequacy of facilities. Beginning teachers strongly agreed that their art areas were not large enough, but experienced teachers gave a variety of responses to that item. Moderate agreement of prospective teachers on the subject of sufficient lighting was contrasted with strong agreement from all practising teacher groups, but this was attributed to the prospective teachers' lack of a real situation for evaluation.

No significant differences were noted between experience level groups on items dealing with time considerations, materials, or repairs.

Career considerations were a source of only one strongly significant difference between experience level groups. Item 15, "I feel my lack of experience creates special problems during my first years of teaching," brought much higher levels of agreement from prospective and beginning teachers than from experienced teachers. Prospective and beginning teachers indicated that they perceived their inexperience as a source of problems, while those with some years of experience seemed to draw upon a different perception of the problems created by inexperience.

Percentage Levels of Art Taught

When respondents were grouped according to percentage of art taught, significantly different responses were elicited to Items 1, 2, and 3 dealing with art teaching facilities. All groups, except those with 26% to 50% art in their timetables, registered moderate agreement with Item 1, that art teaching facilities made it possible to present all those aspects of the art program considered important by the respondent. The disagreement registered by the 26% to 50% group was perhaps due to the possibility that these respondents did not conduct their small proportion of art classes in regular art areas.

Ambiguous results occurred between percentage level groups in response to Items 2 and 3, dealing with adequate size of art areas and sufficient lighting. In both instances, moderate agreement was given by prospective teachers and those with 51% to 75% art in their timetables, while those with 26% to 50% art and 76% to 100% art gave strong agreement. Thus, no reasonable correlation could be made between amount of art taught and response to either item, though differences were found to be significant in both cases.

No significant differences were found between percentage level groups on items dealing with time considerations, materials, or repairs.

Career considerations revealed significant differences between the groups on only one item. Item 15, which suggested that lack of experience creates special problems during beginning teaching years, elicited moderate to strong agreement from all except the 76% to 100% art group. Since 74% of the experienced teachers fell in the category of teaching 76% to 100% art, the similarity of response between the experienced teacher group and the 76% to 100% art group was inevitable; the experienced teacher group also showed notably less agreement with Item 15 than any other experience level group.

SECTION B: THE HUMAN ELEMENTS

The items in this category totalled 20, divided among the sub-categories Art Supervisors, Parents, School Administration, Teaching

Responsibilities, Classes, Extra Curricular Responsibility, Other Teachers, and Other Factors. Each of these items was tabulated and analysed to determine the perceptions of the human aspects of art teacher well-being held by the respondents.

Art Supervisors (Items 17, 18, 32). Items dealing with the role of art supervisory personnel are summarized below.

Item 17. *The art supervisor and art staff of central office contact me regularly.*

Moderate to strong disagreement was the response of the total sample. An important factor which must be considered in interpreting this finding was the proportion of respondents from rural school systems. Although no survey was undertaken to determine the percentage of respondents not affiliated with large urban school boards, it should be noted that a number of responses came from teachers who had no supervisory art personnel. Moderate disagreement was shown by those teachers who had not yet become affiliated with a school board, divided responses were given by beginning teachers, and very strong disagreement came from those teachers experienced in teaching art (Table 19).

Item 18. *The art staff of my board does not seem to support my efforts.*

Although a substantial number of the total sample indicated that they were not contacted regularly by the art supervisory staff of their boards, they rejected the statement in Item 18, thus perceiving their efforts to be supported by the art staffs. Varying perceptions of the role of art supervisory staff were evident among prospective teachers.

TABLE 19

ITEM 17
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	2.8	21.1	7.3	35.8	33.0
Experience Levels					
Prospective	2.6	10.5	13.2	55.3	18.4
Beginning	--	33.3	9.5	23.8	33.3*
Experienced	4.0	24.0	2.0	26.0	44.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	2.6	10.5	13.2	55.3	18.4
26 - 50	--	50.0	--	33.3	16.7
51 - 75	--	33.3	--	16.7	50.0
76 - 100	3.8	22.6	5.7	26.4	41.5
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	3.3	26.2	4.9	36.1	29.5
U. of Calgary	2.1	14.6	10.4	35.4	37.5

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

A high degree of neutrality was registered by the beginning teachers, possibly because they felt their experience with central office personnel too limited to make an assessment. Experienced teachers, however, --those whose opinions might be expected to be fully formed--also maintained a high degree of neutrality. Again, it should be acknowledged that the differences between urban and rural school systems may have influenced these results (Table 20).

TABLE 20

ITEM 18
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	4.6	21.1	26.6	33.9	13.8
Experience Levels					
Prospective	--	36.8	15.8	42.1	5.3
Beginning	4.8	19.0	38.1	23.8	14.3*
Experienced	8.0	10.0	30.0	32.0	20.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	--	36.8	15.8	42.1	5.3
26 - 50	--	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7
51 - 75	16.7	16.7	25.0	25.0	16.7
76 - 100	5.7	11.3	34.0	30.2	18.9
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	4.9	19.7	21.3	39.3	14.8
U. of Calgary	4.2	22.9	33.3	27.1	12.5

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

Item 32. *Helpful in-service programs are seldom offered by my board for art teachers.*

The total sample responses were divided on this item. Prospective teachers moderately agreed that in-service programs would be seldom available for art teachers, while beginning teachers disagreed, perceiving that such programs were available to them. Experienced teachers also felt that in-service was definitely available.

Highly significant differences were also found between percentage levels. Those teachers with the least amount of art and those with the greatest amount of art in their timetables were in strongest disagreement with the statement that in-service programs were seldom offered (Table 21).

Parents (Items 20, 29, 36). Items concerning contact between art teachers and parents of students are summarized below.

Item 20. *Any art fee charged to my students creates complaints from parents.*

The total sample perceived no problem with parents on the topic of fees. Significant differences occurred between experience level, percentage level, and university groups, however.

Perceptions of prospective teachers seemed to be that art fees were a potential problem, while those practising for several years strongly disagreed that parents objected to art fees. Among percentage level groups, the trend was towards less concern about parental complaints as perceived by art teachers who taught the greatest amount of art. Respondents trained at the University of Alberta were in moderate disagreement with the statement, while those trained at the University

TABLE 21

ITEM 32
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	14.5	23.6	11.8	30.0	20.0
Experience Levels					
Prospective	17.9	38.5	23.1	15.4	5.1
Beginning	14.3	19.0	4.8	33.3	28.6*
Experienced	12.0	14.0	6.0	40.0	28.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	17.9	38.5	23.1	15.4	5.1
26 - 50	--	--	16.7	16.7	66.7*
51 - 75	33.3	16.7	--	33.3	16.7
76 - 100	9.4	17.0	5.7	41.5	26.4
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	16.4	24.6	13.1	27.9	18.0
U. of Calgary	12.2	22.4	10.2	32.7	22.4

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

of Calgary were in strong disagreement (Table 22).

TABLE 22

ITEM 20
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	1.8	24.8	13.8	25.7	33.9
Experience Levels					
Prospective	2.6	39.5	5.3	44.7	7.9
Beginning	4.8	19.0	23.8	33.3	19.0*
Experienced	--	16.0	16.0	8.0	60.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	2.6	39.5	5.3	44.7	7.9
26 - 50	--	33.3	16.7	33.3	16.7
51 - 75	--	25.0	16.7	16.7	* 41.7
76 - 100	1.9	13.2	18.9	13.2	52.8
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	3.3	19.7	16.4	34.4	26.2
U. of Calgary	--	31.3	10.4	14.6	* 43.8

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

Item 29. *Parents of my students seem to take an interest in the art program I am offering their children.*

The total sample gave moderate agreement to Item 29. No significant differences occurred between experience levels, but among percentage level groups, perceptions of prospective teachers and those with the most art in their timetables were similar and in strong contrast to the responses of the middle level groups. This differing perception among those who taught less art may have arisen from the fact that they taught larger proportions of other subjects, and thus dealt with parents in other realms besides art (Table 23).

TABLE 23

ITEM 29
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	7.3	49.1	10.0	18.2	15.5
Experience Levels					
Prospective	10.3	59.0	12.8	12.8	5.1
Beginning	--	42.9	9.5	19.0	28.6
Experienced	8.0	44.0	8.0	22.0	18.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	10.3	59.0	12.8	12.8	5.1
26 - 50	--	16.6	--	33.3	50.0
51 - 75	--	25.0	8.3	16.7	50.0*
76 - 100	7.5	50.9	9.4	20.8	11.3
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	4.9	55.7	9.8	14.8	14.8
U. of Calgary	10.2	40.8	10.2	22.4	16.3

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

Item 36. *I believe that the parents of my students see art as an "easy" subject.*

All groups gave very definite support for the proposition that parents considered art an "easy" subject (Table 24).

TABLE 24

ITEM 36
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	43.6	39.1	7.3	10.0	--
Experience Levels					
Prospective	38.5	46.2	5.1	10.3	--
Beginning	57.1	38.1	4.8	--	--
Experienced	42.0	34.0	10.0	14.0	--
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	38.5	46.2	5.1	10.3	--
26 - 50	83.3	16.7	--	--	--
51 - 75	75.0	16.7	8.3	--	--
76 - 100	35.8	41.5	9.4	13.2	--
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	42.6	37.7	11.5	8.2	--
U. of Calgary	44.9	40.8	2.0	12.2	--

School administration (Items 19, 21, 24, 27). Items dealing with the interaction between the art teacher and the administration of his school were tabulated and analysed.

Item 19. *I have the full co-operation of the caretaking staff.*

All groups generally perceived that caretaking staffs were supportive of art teachers and lent their full co-operation (Table 25).

TABLE 25

ITEM 19
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	36.7	36,7	3.7	19.3	3.7
Experience Levels					
Prospective	21.8	39.5	7.9	26.3	5.3
Beginning	33.3	38.1	--	23.8	4.8
Experienced	50.0	34.0	2.0	12.0	2.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	21.1	39.5	7.9	26.3	5.3
25 - 50	33.3	50.0	--	16.7	--
51 - 75	50.0	16.7	--	16.7	16.7
76 - 100	45.3	37.7	1.9	15.1	--
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	39.3	39.3	1.6	16.4	3.3
U. of Calgary	33.3	33.3	6.3	22.9	4.2

Item 21. *My principal supports my budget requests when other teachers ask for justification of them.*

Of the total sample, equal portions expressed moderate agreement and neutrality. Neutrality may have indicated that this was not a situation commonly encountered by art teachers, an indifference to the item, or a misunderstanding of the meaning of the item. Prospective teachers offered a positive assessment of administrative support, beginning teachers were neutral, and experienced teachers gave no conclusive response.

Among percentage level groups, the greatest agreement came from the prospective teachers and the greatest neutrality from those who taught the most art. The most important result to be noted here was the great difference between the perception of the prospective teaching group and the groups of practising art teachers (Table 26).

TABLE 26

ITEM 21
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	16.7	34.3	33.3	13.9	1.9
Experience Levels					
Prospective	7.9	55.3	10.5	23.7	2.6
Beginning	14.3	19.0	57.1	9.5	--*
Experienced	24.5	24.5	40.8	8.2	2.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	7.9	55.3	10.5	23.7	2.6
26 - 50	16.7	33.3	33.3	--	16.7
51 - 75	9.1	45.5	27.3	18.2	* --
76 - 100	24.5	17.0	50.9	7.5	--
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	15.0	38.3	28.3	16.7	1.7
U. of Calgary	18.8	29.2	39.6	10.4	2.1

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

Item 24. *The administration recognizes that there are particular circumstances to be considered in running an art program.*

The response of the total sample showed agreement that the administration of their schools recognized the particular circumstances of an art program. No significant differences were found between any of the comparison groups (Table 27).

TABLE 27

ITEM 24
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	23.6	45.5	9.1	18.2	3.6
Experience Levels					
Prospective	17.9	56.4	10.3	15.4	--
Beginning	23.8	33.3	14.3	23.8	4.8
Experienced	28.0	42.0	6.0	18.0	6.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	17.9	56.4	10.3	15.4	--
26 - 50	16.7	50.0	16.6	--	16.7
51 - 75	33.3	33.3	--	16.7	16.7
76 - 100	26.4	39.6	9.4	22.6	1.9
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	23.0	44.3	11.5	16.4	4.9
U. of Calgary	24.5	46.9	6.1	20.4	2.0

Item 27. *I am encouraged by the administration to pursue my own artistic interests outside of class time.*

A high degree of neutrality was shown by the total sample in response to this item. Prospective teachers perceived their future administrators as encouraging them to pursue their own artistic interests. Practising teachers either gave neutral responses or disagreed that the administration would encourage their artistic pursuits.

The strongest disagreement among percentage level groups came from those teachers who taught 26% to 50% art. Neutral responses occurred most frequently among the higher percentage level groups. Again, the practising teacher groups registered a less positive assessment of administrative support than those teachers who were not yet in the field (Table 28).

Teaching responsibilities (Item 25)

Item 25. *I should not be expected to teach other subjects besides art.*

Within the total sample, responses of strong to moderate agreement indicated that most respondents felt they should not be expected to teach any other subjects. All comparison groups agreed, giving no significant differences on this item (Table 29).

Classes (Items 22, 28, 33). Consideration of class sizes, timetabling, and discipline are described below.

Item 22. *Most or all of my classes are too large for a good art learning situation.*

The majority of art teachers surveyed felt strongly that their

TABLE 28

ITEM 27
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	14.5	18.2	28.2	20.0	19.1
Experience Levels					
Prospective	33.3	30.8	15.4	17.9	2.6
Beginning	4.8	4.8	38.1	33.3	19.0*
Experienced	4.0	14.0	34.0	16.0	32.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	33.3	30.8	15.4	17.9	2.6
26 - 50	--	--	16.7	16.7	16.7
51 - 75	--	8.3	33.3	25.0	33.3*
76 - 100	5.7	13.2	37.7	20.8	22.6
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	16.4	23.0	26.2	19.7	14.8
U. of Calgary	12.2	12.2	30.6	20.4	24.5

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

TABLE 29

ITEM 25
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	37.3	30.0	6.4	17.3	9.1
Experience Levels					
Prospective	38.5	33.3	--	23.1	5.1
Beginning	33.3	28.6	14.3	14.3	9.5
Experienced	38.0	28.0	8.0	14.0	12.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	38.5	33.3	--	23.1	5.1
26 - 50	33.3	16.6	--	16.7	33.3
51 - 75	25.0	33.3	8.3	25.0	8.3
76 - 100	39.6	28.3	11.3	11.3	9.4
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	26.2	32.8	6.6	23.0	11.5
U. of Calgary	51.0	26.7	6.1	10.2	6.1

classes were too large for a good art learning situation. Among experience levels, the trend seemed to be towards very strong agreement among beginning teachers, diminishing to less strong agreement from experienced teachers and those who had not yet taught. Beginning teachers seemed to perceive the greatest difficulty with large classes, possibly because most beginning teachers are placed in junior high schools where large classes tend to be the norm (Table 30).

TABLE 30

ITEM 22
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	44.0	22.9	3.7	18.3	11.0
Experience Levels					
Prospective	36.8	36.8	5.3	21.1	--
Beginning	52.4	23.8	--	14.3	9.5*
Experienced	46.0	12.0	4.0	18.0	20.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	36.8	36.8	5.3	21.1	--
26 - 50	33.3	50.0	--	--	--
51 - 75	58.3	8.3	--	16.7	16.7
76 - 100	47.2	13.2	3.8	18.9	17.0
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	45.9	26.2	3.3	19.7	4.9
U. of Calgary	41.7	18.8	4.2	16.7	18.8

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

Item 28. *The timetabling of this school has my support.*

Results of the total sample seemed to indicate that the majority of art teachers surveyed approved of the timetables in their schools.

Among experience level groups and percentage level groups, highly significant differences were noted. Prospective teachers were highly neutral to this statement, a reasonable response since they had no actual school situation in which to assess timetabling. Of practising teacher groups, the general trend was to greater acceptance of timetables as years of teaching experience accumulated.

Although significance value for percentage level groups on Item 28 was .0011, indicating highly significant differences, no trend appeared in this comparison of percentage level groups, as each showed its highest response level in a different category (Table 31).

Item 33. *I have few serious discipline problems with art students.*

The moderate to strong agreement shown by the total sample gave substantial support to the belief that there were few serious discipline problems with art students.

Experienced teachers gave the highest amount of support for this statement, while beginning teachers indicated that they perceived the greatest number of discipline problems among their students. The comparison of percentage level groups revealed that teachers with smaller portions of art in their timetables seemed to disagree more frequently with the proposition than did those who taught almost all art, or those who had not yet begun to teach (Table 32).

TABLE 31

ITEM 28
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	20.9	31.8	15.5	19.1	12.7
Experience Levels					
Prospective	7.7	28.2	33.3	23.1	7.7
Beginning	19.0	42.9	9.5	19.0	9.5*
Experienced	32.0	30.0	4.0	16.0	18.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	7.7	28.2	33.3	23.1	7.7
26 - 50	50.0	16.7	16.6	--	16.7
51 - 75	16.7	8.3	16.7	25.0	33.3*
76 - 100	28.3	41.5	1.9	17.0	11.3
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	14.8	34.4	23.0	14.8	13.1
U. of Calgary	28.6	28.6	6.1	24.5	12.2

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

TABLE 32

ITEM 33
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	33.6	39.1	5.5	12.7	9.1
Experience Levels					
Prospective	25.6	59.0	2.6	10.3	2.6
Beginning	14.3	38.1	9.5	19.0	19.0*
Experienced	48.0	24.0	6.0	12.0	10.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	25.6	59.0	2.6	10.3	2.6
26 - 50	33.3	16.7	--	33.3	16.7 *
51 - 75	16.7	16.7	8.3	41.7	16.7
76 - 100	43.4	32.1	7.5	5.7	11.3
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	27.9	42.6	4.9	14.8	9.8
U. of Calgary	40.8	34.7	6.1	10.2	8.2

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

Extra-curricular responsibility (Items 23, 34, 35). The ways in which the art teachers perceived their extra-curricular expectations are summarized below.

Item 23. *I feel that the art department has no obligation to make posters and decorations for other school organizations.*

Some division of opinion on this issue was indicated by the split agreement and disagreement of the total group. Prospective teachers felt that art departments had obligations with regard to poster and decoration making, while beginning teachers did not, and experienced teachers registered both agreement and disagreement. Beginning teachers may have felt that their regular classroom responsibilities were too demanding to allow them to undertake extra projects (Table 33).

Item 34. *I see participation in extra-curricular activities as part of any teacher's responsibility.*

Moderate agreement seemed to be the norm among the total sample, while significant differences appeared between the groups both in experience levels and percentage levels. The level of agreement seemed to diminish as the respondents became more experienced. This result seemed to contradict the results of Item 33, where beginning teachers showed greater resistance to extra project responsibilities for the art department.

Among percentage level groups, the group of teachers with 26% to 50% art in their timetables deviated sharply in their response to this item from the moderate agreement of the other group responses (Table 34).

TABLE 33

ITEM 23
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	21.1	30.3	3.7	33.9	11.0
Experience Levels					
Prospective	10.5	34.2	2.6	44.7	7.9
Beginning	19.0	33.3	14.3	28.6	4.8*
Experienced	30.0	26.0	--	28.0	16.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	10.5	34.2	2.6	44.7	7.9
26-50	50.0	16.7	--	33.3	--
51 - 75	41.7	25.0	8.3	8.3	16.7
76 - 100	20.8	30.2	3.8	32.1	13.2
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	16.4	29.5	3.3	39.3	11.5
U. of Calgary	27.1	31.3	4.2	27.1	10.4

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

TABLE 34

ITEM 34
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	28.2	50.9	1.8	8.2	10.9
Experience Levels					
Prospective	35.9	56.4	--	--	7.7
Beginning	23.8	52.4	9.5	14.3	-- *
Experienced	24.0	46.0	--	12.0	18.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	35.9	56.4	--	--	7.7
26 - 50	16.7	16.7	--	33.3	33.3
51 - 75	16.7	41.7	8.3	8.3	25.0 *
76 - 100	26.4	52.8	1.9	11.3	7.5
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	29.5	55.7	--	4.9	9.8
U. of Calgary	26.5	44.9	4.1	12.2	12.2

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

Item 35. *I receive commendation for extra projects undertaken by my department.*

Moderate agreement by the total group indicated that most art teachers surveyed felt that their extra projects did receive positive commendation. All experience levels gave similar responses. Among percentage level groups, the group of teachers with 26% to 50% art in their timetables was substantially stronger in their support of the statement than were the other groups (Table 35).

Other teachers (Item 30)

Item 30. *Other teachers see my job as "easy."*

Within the total sample, moderate to strong agreement was given to the statement that other teachers saw art teaching as an "easy" job.

No significant differences were found between experience levels. In percentage levels, neutral responses were highest among those teachers with lesser amounts of art in their timetables. Prospective teachers and those with 76% to 100% art in their timetables agreed that other teachers perceived the art teacher's job as easy. Perhaps the neutrality of the middle groups was due to a different perception of their role: teachers who taught lesser amounts of art may not actually have perceived themselves as art teachers (Table 36).

Other factors (Items 26, 31). Two other factors concerning art teachers' feelings about bringing their own belongings for classroom use and the use of their art rooms by community groups are summarized

TABLE 35

ITEM 35
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	22.7	47.3	14.5	12.7	2.7
Experience Levels					
Prospective	20.5	51.3	17.9	10.3	--
Beginning	19.0	47.6	14.3	19.0	--
Experienced	26.0	44.0	12.0	12.0	6.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	20.5	51.3	17.9	10.3	--
26 - 50	50.0	--	33.3	--	16.7
51 - 75	25.0	33.3	--	25.0	16.7*
76 - 100	20.8	52.8	13.2	13.2	--
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	18.0	49.2	14.8	14.8	3.3
U. of Calgary	28.6	44.9	14.3	10.2	2.0

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

TABLE 36

ITEM 30
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	24.5	32.7	14.5	20.9	7.3
Experience Levels					
Prospective	30.8	41.0	7.7	20.5	--
Beginning	23.8	38.1	14.3	14.3	9.5
Experienced	20.0	24.0	20.0	24.0	12.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	30.8	41.0	7.7	20.5	--
26 - 50	--	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7
51 - 75	25.0	--	33.3	16.7	25.0*
76 - 100	22.6	34.0	13.2	22.6	7.5
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	21.3	32.8	16.4	21.3	8.2
U. of Calgary	28.6	32.7	12.2	20.4	6.1

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

below.

Item 26. *I feel that I can safely bring my own books, art objects and materials to school without fear of theft or vandalism.*

The response to this item was varied, but a general trend towards disagreement was gained from the total sample. Teachers tended to indicate that they felt they could not safely bring their own books and supplies to school for student use. Prospective teachers perceived the situation in a notably different way than did practising teachers, expressing a far more positive feeling about the possibility of safely taking personal belongings to school. Teachers with 75% or less art in their timetables recorded strong disagreement, while those with greater than 75% art were divided between strong and moderate disagreement. It seemed that while prospective teachers expressed the optimistic belief that their personal belongings would be safe in the classroom, practising teachers implied either a variety of situations or a variety of expectations about their students in this regard (Table 37).

Item 31. *I approve of the use of my classroom by community groups in the evening.*

A varied response was again received from the total sample with respect to after-school use of their classrooms. There was a tendency towards greater disagreement with the statement. It should be recognized that rural schools were not frequently used for evening community activities, and, thus, some of the sample would not have experienced the situation (Table 38).

TABLE 37

ITEM 26
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	7.3	33.6	2.9	25.5	30.9
Experience Levels					
Prospective	--	46.2	5.1	33.3	15.4
Beginning	4.8	23.8	4.8	19.0	47.6*
Experienced	14.0	28.0	--	22.0	36.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	--	46.2	5.1	33.3	15.4
26 - 50	--	33.3	--	--	66.7
51 - 75	8.3	8.3	--	33.3	50.0*
76 - 100	13.2	30.2	1.9	20.8	34.0
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	4.9	31.1	4.9	29.5	29.5
U. of Calgary	10.2	36.7	--	20.4	32.7

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

TABLE 38

ITEM 31
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	14.5	24.5	6.4	21.8	32.7
Experience Levels					
Prospective	23.1	25.6	7.7	23.1	20.5
Beginning	--	23.8	14.3	19.0	42.9
Experienced	14.0	24.0	2.0	22.0	38.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	23.1	25.6	7.7	23.1	20.5
26 - 50	--	33.3	--	16.7	50.0
51 - 75	25.0	8.3	8.3	25.0	33.3
76 - 100	7.5	26.4	5.7	20.8	39.6
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	13.1	19.7	6.6	29.5	31.1
U. of Calgary	16.3	30.6	6.1	12.2	34.7

SUMMARY OF SECTION B: THE HUMAN ELEMENTS

Some of the most important results to be gained from this study were found in the responses to Section B, which dealt with the art teacher's interaction with administrative personnel, parents of students, and other teachers.

Total Responses

The validity of responses by the total sample to the items dealing with art supervisors was acknowledged to have been affected by the limited number of respondents who had actual contact with any form of art supervisory personnel or who had in-service opportunity. Results could not, therefore, be too stringently interpreted. Moderate to strong disagreement was expressed with the proposition that art staffs and supervisors contacted the respondents regularly. However, disagreement with the statement that art staffs of their boards did not support their efforts seemed to indicate that, while the respondents perceived little contact from their art supervisory personnel, they did not perceive a lack of support from this group.

The topic of parents' attitudes toward fees brought general disagreement from the total sample that art fees created complaints from parents, and a general agreement that parents took an interest in the art program which the teacher offered. An important result came from the statement, "I believe that the parents of my students see art as an easy subject" (Item 36). Strong agreement was registered by the total group for this item. This perception could be a source of problems, as the art teacher continually deals with parents whom he may feel have evaluated his subject as requiring less serious attention than other school subjects.

School administration items brought few important conclusions from the total sample. Strong to moderate agreement was given to the statement that caretaking staffs were co-operative with art teachers. Neutral responses were high both on the question of principal's support of art budget requirements and the statement, "I am encouraged by the administration to pursue my own artistic interests outside of class time" (Item 27). These responses could have indicated either indifference to such issues or situations seldom faced by art teachers. The total sample moderately agreed that administrations recognized the particular circumstances under which art programs are conducted.

An important result was gained from Item 25, "I should not be expected to teach other subjects besides art." Art teachers in the study apparently did not wish to teach other subjects, as indicated by strong to moderate agreement with this statement.

Art teachers also strongly agreed that classes were too large for good art learning situations. Most expressed moderate or strong agreement with the timetabling they were given, and moderate to strong agreement also resulted from the statement, "I have few serious discipline problems with art students" (Item 33).

The total sample was split in response to the proposition that the art department has no obligation to make posters and decorations for other school organizations. However, they gave moderate agreement to two aspects of extra-curricular responsibilities: extra-curricular activity was part of any teacher's responsibility, and commendation was normally received for extra projects undertaken by the art department.

The perception that "Other teachers see my job as 'easy'" (Item 30) brought moderate to strong agreement from the total sample. This image of art teaching supposedly held by fellow teachers could be a source of discouragement for the art teacher.

Art teachers hinted at a wide variety of teaching situations by the tenor of their responses to the proposition that taking personal books and supplies to school for student use was a safe practice. While most disagreed that this practice was advisable, a substantial fraction gave moderate agreement.

Varied responses were given to the idea that the respondent approved of the use of his classroom by community groups in the evening, but this mixture of responses may have been partially attributable to the different situations encountered in rural and urban schools, as well as the different kinds of experiences the respondents may have encountered at first hand in this regard.

Experience Levels

The difference between experience level groups in response to Item 17, "The art supervisor and art staff of central office contact me regularly," was significant. Prospective teachers, who were not yet affiliated with a school board, expressed moderate disagreement, contrasted with divided response by beginning teachers, who had not yet established their opinions on the role of supervisory staff, and strong disagreement from the experienced teachers. This response could not be construed as an entirely negative assessment of the role of the art supervisor and his staff, however, because the response trend on Item 18, "The art staff of my board does not seem to support my efforts," was moderate disagreement. The combined result indicated that although teachers of higher experience levels felt that their art supervisory staff did not often contact them, they agreed that those people supported their efforts. It was noted again that the difference between urban and rural school systems may have influenced these results.

Item 32 brought an interesting distinction between experience level groups. Although prospective teachers perceived in-service programs as seldom offered, beginning and experienced teachers disagreed and supported the availability of in-service programs for art teachers.

While practising teacher groups disagreed with the statement that art fees created complaints from parents, prospective teachers were divided with respect to the idea that parents would object to art fees. All experience levels agreed that parents took an interest in the art programs they taught and that parents considered art an easy subject.

On the subject of school administration, all teachers agreed that caretaking staffs were co-operative with art teachers. Prospective teachers differed in their perception of principals' support for budget requests, expressing moderate agreement with the notion that principals would show support for their budget request. Practising teacher groups were neutral on this item. Prospective teachers also differed in their perception of the administrations' encouragement of their own artistic pursuits. They agreed that this encouragement would be forthcoming, while practising teachers (with increasing experience) showed increasing levels of disagreement with this proposition.

All groups showed similar levels of strong agreement that they should not be expected to teach subjects other than art. This result correlated logically with the strong agreement given to the statement in Item 13, "I chose art education as a field because of my love of art," and, together, they suggested that art teachers considered their subject unique and requiring special qualifications.

Strongest agreement with the statement that classes were too large for a good learning situation was received from beginning teachers, although all groups registered strong agreement with this item. This seemed to indicate that beginning teachers perceived the greatest difficulty with handling large classes. The timetabling statement brought predictable neutrality from the prospective teachers who had no actual classes to assess, and practising teachers generally supported the timetables they encountered. All groups were in agreement that there were few serious discipline problems, but greatest agreement came from prospective teachers and least from beginning teachers.

With regard to extra-curricular responsibilities, the prospective teachers consistently arrogated the greatest amount of responsibility to the art teacher. They felt that art departments were obliged to help with posters and decorations, while beginning teachers disagreed and experienced teachers gave a split response. Prospective teachers felt that art teachers had responsibilities in extra-curricular activities, while practising teachers groups gave increasingly less agreement to this as they reached higher levels of experience. All groups agreed that they received due commendation for extra projects undertaken by the art department.

All groups agreed that they felt other teachers perceived their job as "easy." Prospective teachers agreed that books, art objects, and materials could be taken to school without fear of theft or vandalism, but this proposition brought strong disagreement from practising teacher groups. The trend among all experience level groups for Item 31, "I approve of the use of my classroom by community groups in the evening," was towards disagreement.

Percentage Levels of Art Taught

All percentage level groups except those with 26% to 50% art were in disagreement with the proposition that art supervisors contacted them regularly, but the connotations of this response are not necessarily negative. All percentage level groups indicated that they felt their art supervisory staffs did support their efforts. Teachers with very little art in their timetables, and those with the greatest amount of art in their timetables, seemed most cognizant of in-service program availability. The middle group was split on this issue, and prospective teachers perceived that art in-service programs were seldom offered.

The subject of parents brought some significant differences between percentage level groups. Prospective teachers and those with very little art (26% to 50%) were split on the question of whether or not art fees created complaints from parents, but those teachers with more art disagreed that art fees caused parents to object. Prospective teachers and those with 76% to 100% art agreed that parents were interested in the art programs they offered, while the middle groups strongly disagreed with this statement. All percentage level groups agreed that parents thought of art as an "easy" subject.

Moderate to strong agreement was given by the percentage level groups to the idea that caretakers were co-operative, with no significant differences apparent between groups on this issue. Moderate agreement was given by teachers with very little art to the proposition that principals supported art teachers' budget requests. Teachers with more art in their timetables tended to favour neutrality on that item. All percentage level groups agreed that the particular circumstances under which an art program is taught were recognized by their administrations. Significant differences were found between percentage level groups in response to Item 27, "I am encouraged by the administration to pursue my own artistic interests outside of class time." Prospective teachers agreed, those teachers with 26% to 50% art disagreed strongly, teachers with 51% to 75% art were split, and teachers with the greatest amount of art were neutral.

All percentage level groups seemed to agree that they should not be required to teach subjects other than art.

All percentage level groups gave similar levels of agreement to the proposition that classes were normally too large for a good art learning situation. Percentage levels were distributed across the response scale with regard to the efficacy of timetables, giving no clear trend on this item. Prospective teachers moderately agreed that there were few serious discipline problems in art classes; teachers with lesser amounts of art in their timetables took some exception to that proposition, but teachers with the most art (76% to 100%) strongly agreed that few serious discipline problems existed in art classes.

The question of extra-curricular responsibilities brought two instances of significant difference between the groups. Item 34, "I see participation in extra-curricular activities as part of any teacher's responsibility," brought similar agreement from all groups except the 26% to 50% art group, who offered responses split between moderate and strong agreement. All groups except those in the 26% to 50% art group were in moderate agreement that they received commendation for extra projects: the 26% to 50% group favoured strong agreement. All percentage levels disagreed that the art department had no obligation to make posters and decorations for other school organizations.

Some slight significance was apparent between percentage level groups on Item 30, "Other teachers see my job as 'easy.'" Prospective teachers and those with the most art gave moderate to strong agreement, while the middle percentage level groups gave slight agreement and neutral responses. Prospective teachers expressed greatest agreement that books and personal belongings could be taken to art classes safely, while teachers in the 26% to 75% art range strongly disagreed. Those teachers with greater than 75% art in their timetables were split between strong disagreement and moderate agreement with the statement. All percentage levels disagreed with the idea that their classrooms be used by community groups in the evenings.

University Attended

Only one item, in Section B, Item 20, showed any significant difference between responses according to university attended. This occurrence was attributed to chance, and no effort was made to connect the significant item to any aspect of the art teacher training programs offered by the two universities.

SECTION C: CURRICULAR CONSIDERATIONS

There were 14 items in this category, distributed among the sub-categories Student Attitudes, Grading, Philosophy, Types of Students, Image of Art as a Subject, Students' Program Preferences, and Program Planning. The items in each sub-category are summarized and tabulated below.

Student attitude (Items 37, 39, 44, 46). Items dealing with student interest, co-operation, and motivation are described here.

Item 37. *The students seem to acknowledge the importance of an art program.*

A difference of opinion among art teachers in general was indicated by the division in response on the subject of student attitude towards art. Prospective teachers and those with the most art were more positive in their responses to Item 37 than were the groups with less than full-time art, who favoured strong disagreement. These positively disposed groups represented the totally inexperienced and the most experienced teachers (Table 39).

Item 39. *Students who enter my classes are easy to motivate.*

Overall, a slightly negative response was received from all groups to the statement that art students are easy to motivate (Table 40).

TABLE 39

ITEM 37
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	10.9	39.1	5.5	32.7	11.8
Experience Levels					
Prospective	10.3	43.6	12.8	30.8	2.6
Beginning	4.8	33.3	--	33.3	28.6*
Experienced	14.0	38.0	2.0	34.0	12.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	10.3	43.6	12.8	30.8	2.6
26 - 50	16.7	16.7	--	16.7	50.0
51 - 75	8.3	16.7	--	33.3	41.7*
76 - 100	11.3	43.4	1.9	35.8	7.5
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	11.5	31.1	4.9	41.0	11.5
U. of Calgary	10.2	49.0	6.1	22.4	12.2

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

TABLE 40

ITEM 39
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	5.5	35.5	5.5	42.7	10.9
Experience Levels					
Prospective	7.7	38.5	5.1	46.2	2.6
Beginning	--	33.3	4.8	47.6	14.3
Experienced	6.0	34.0	6.0	38.0	16.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	7.7	38.5	5.1	46.2	2.6
26 - 50	--	--	--	83.3	16.7
51 - 75	--	41.7	8.3	25.0	25.0
76 - 100	5.7	35.8	5.7	39.6	13.2
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	6.6	32.8	6.6	42.6	11.5
U. of Calgary	4.1	38.8	4.1	42.9	10.2

Item 44. *Some students show an interest in art outside of class time.*

Solid support was given to this statement by all groups, indicating that the art teachers surveyed had students who expressed enough interest to participate in art activities outside of regularly scheduled classes (Table 41).

TABLE 41

ITEM 44
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	41.8	53.6	--	3.6	0.9
Experience Levels					
Prospective	35.9	61.5	--	2.6	--
Beginning	33.3	57.1	--	9.5	--
Experienced	50.0	56.0	--	2.0	2.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	35.9	61.5	--	2.6	--
26 - 50	66.7	33.3	--	--	--
51 - 75	25.0	66.7	--	--	8.3
76 - 100	47.2	47.2	--	5.7	--
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	37.7	59.0	--	1.6	1.6
U. of Calgary	46.9	46.9	--	6.1	--

Item 46. *Lack of co-operation from some students prohibits attempting some aspects of the curriculum.*

Generally, the response was one of moderate agreement with this item. However, among experience level groups, beginning teachers seemed to experience the greatest problem with lack of co-operation from students. In the percentage level comparison, teachers in the 51% to 75% art range showed the strongest agreement, while least agreement came from those teachers with the most art in their timetables (Table 42).

TABLE 42

ITEM 46
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	20.9	41.8	5.5	26.4	5.5
Experience Levels					
Prospective	--	48.7	10.3	35.9	5.1
Beginning	33.3	57.1	--	4.8	4.8*
Experienced	32.0	30.0	4.0	28.0	6.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	--	48.7	10.3	35.9	5.1
26 - 50	16.7	50.0	--	33.3	--
51 - 75	66.7	33.3	--	--	--*
76 - 100	26.4	37.7	3.8	24.5	7.5
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	23.0	41.0	3.3	27.9	4.9
U. of Calgary	18.4	42.9	8.2	24.5	6.1

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

Grading (Item 38)

Item 38. *I find it hard to justify my system of grading.*

Moderate to strong disagreement with this statement indicated that all groups believed their grading systems to be justified (Table 43).

TABLE 43

ITEM 38
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	3.6	11.8	2.7	40.9	40.9
Experience Levels					
Prospective	2.6	7.7	2.6	51.3	35.9
Beginning	--	14.3	9.5	38.1	38.1
Experienced	6.0	14.0	--	34.0	46.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	2.6	7.7	2.6	51.3	35.9
26 - 50	16.7	--	--	50.0	33.3
51 - 75	16.7	--	--	41.7	41.7
76 - 100	--	18.9	3.8	32.1	45.3
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	3.3	9.8	3.3	49.2	34.4
U. of Calgary	4.1	14.3	2.0	30.6	49.0

Philosophy (Items 40, 48, 49). Some philosophical considerations of art teaching are examined below.

Item 40. *I believe that art can be taught in some measure to every student.*

Very strong support was given to this statement by all groups in the survey (Table 44).

TABLE 44

ITEM 40
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	57.3	32.7	1.8	6.4	1.8
Experience Levels					
Prospective	51.3	35.9	5.1	7.7	--
Beginning	61.9	28.6	--	4.8	4.8
Experienced	60.0	32.0	--	6.0	2.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	51.3	35.9	5.1	7.7	--
26 - 50	66.7	16.7	--	16.7	--
51 - 75	58.3	33.3	--	8.3	--
76 - 100	60.4	32.1	--	3.8	3.8
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	49.2	37.7	3.3	8.2	1.6
U. of Calgary	67.3	26.5	--	4.1	2.0

Item 48. *Taking outside programs (for example, Community League activity) into consideration, I still feel my program has something unique to offer students.*

Almost unanimous support was given for this statement by the total sample, and there were no significant differences indicated among any of the comparison groups (Table 45).

TABLE 45

ITEM 48
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	77.3	19.1	3.6	--	--
Experience Levels					
Prospective	76.9	20.5	2.6	--	--
Beginning	61.9	28.6	9.5	--	--
Experienced	84.0	14.0	2.0	--	--
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	76.9	20.5	2.6	--	--
26 - 50	50.0	33.3	16.7	--	--
51 - 75	83.3	16.7	--	--	--
76 - 100	79.2	17.0	3.8	--	--
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	73.8	21.3	4.9	--	--
U. of Calgary	81.6	16.3	2.0	--	--

Item 49. *I feel art is a difficult subject to teach.*

Again, all groups gave substantial support for the statement that art is a difficult subject to teach (Table 46).

TABLE 46

ITEM 49
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	34.5	31.8	4.5	22.7	6.4
Experience Levels					
Prospective	20.5	46.2	7.7	25.6	--
Beginning	42.9	28.6	--	23.8	4.8
Experienced	42.0	22.0	4.0	20.0	12.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	20.5	46.2	7.7	25.6	--
26 - 50	50.0	33.3	--	16.7	--
51 - 75	33.3	25.0	--	25.0	16.7
76 - 100	43.4	22.6	3.8	20.8	9.4
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	37.7	36.1	3.3	16.4	6.6
U. of Calgary	30.6	26.5	6.1	30.6	6.1

Types of students (Items 41, 42). Concerns about ability levels of students in art are considered below.

Item 41. *I find it difficult to differentiate my instruction to take account of gifted, poor and average students.*

A large portion of the total art teacher group did not perceive as difficult the differentiation of instruction for gifted, poor, and average students, as seen in their disagreement with Item 41. However, the beginning teacher group showed substantial agreement, in contrast to the responses of prospective and experienced teachers (Table 47).

TABLE 47

ITEM 41
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	9.1	20.9	2.7	39.1	28.2
Experience Levels					
Prospective	2.6	15.4	5.1	46.2	30.8
Beginning	4.8	47.6	--	23.8	23.8*
Experienced	16.0	14.0	2.0	40.0	28.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	2.6	15.4	5.1	46.2	30.8
26 - 50	16.7	16.7	--	66.7	--
51 - 75	16.7	16.7	--	33.3	33.3
76 - 100	11.3	26.4	1.9	32.1	38.3
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	9.8	21.3	3.3	45.9	19.7
U. of Calgary	8.2	20.4	2.0	30.6	38.8

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

Item 42. *I find that many of the higher achievers are chanelled out of my classes in favour of other subjects.*

Just over half the total art teachers questioned perceived higher achieving students being channelled out of their classes. All groups registered some neutrality on this issue (Table 48).

TABLE 48

ITEM 42
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	25.9	26.9	12.0	19.4	15.7
Experience Levels					
Prospective	25.6	25.6	10.3	23.1	15.4
Beginning	19.0	38.1	23.8	14.3	4.8
Experienced	29.2	22.9	8.3	18.8	20.8
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	25.6	25.6	10.3	23.1	15.4
26 - 50	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	--
51 - 75	54.5	--	9.1	9.1	27.3
76 - 100	19.2	32.7	13.5	19.2	15.4
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	32.2	27.1	8.5	22.0	10.2
U. of Calgary	18.4	26.5	16.3	16.3	22.4

Image of art as a subject (Item 43)

Item 43. *Art is considered an intellectual subject by my fellow staff members.*

A substantial majority of the art teachers surveyed indicated, by their disagreement with this statement, that they believed art was not considered an intellectual subject by their fellow staff members (Table 49).

TABLE 49

ITEM 43
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	4.6	17.4	10.1	45.0	22.9
Experience Levels					
Prospective	2.6	13.2	10.5	52.6	21.1
Beginning	--	19.0	--	47.6	33.3
Experienced	8.0	20.0	14.0	38.0	20.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	2.6	13.2	10.5	52.6	21.1
26 - 50	16.7	16.7	--	33.3	33.3
51 - 75	8.3	16.7	8.3	50.0	16.7
76 - 100	3.8	20.8	11.3	39.6	24.5
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	5.0	11.7	10.0	56.7	16.7
U. of Calgary	4.1	24.5	10.2	30.6	30.6

Students' program preferences (Item 45)

Item 45. *Students seem to prefer "crafts" activities to areas such as drawing and painting.*

Wide variations in response were registered in both the total sample and group comparison. It seems likely that many different art teaching situations and expectations of both students and teachers were present, and the term "crafts" could have been construed in various ways to create the distribution of responses to Item 45 (Table 50).

TABLE 50

ITEM 45
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	18.2	36.4	9.1	27.3	9.1
Experience Levels					
Prospective	10.3	38.5	23.1	25.6	2.6
Beginning	33.3	42.9	--	19.0	4.8*
Experienced	18.0	32.0	2.0	32.0	16.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	10.3	38.5	23.1	25.6	2.6
26 - 50	33.3	16.7	--	33.3	16.7
51 - 75	33.3	25.0	--	33.3	8.3*
76 - 100	18.9	39.6	1.9	26.4	13.2
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	18.0	34.4	13.1	27.9	6.6
U. of Calgary	18.4	38.8	4.1	26.5	12.2

*denotes significant difference for this comparison

Program planning (Items 47, 50). Such aspects of program planning as timing of units of study and maintenance of student interest are considered below.

Item 47. *I find it hard to time the completion of one unit so as to make the transition to the next a smooth one for all students.*

The general trend of the total sample, and of the comparison groups, was toward moderate agreement with this statement (Table 51).

TABLE 51

ITEM 47
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	15.5	42.7	6.4	24.5	10.9
Experience Levels					
Prospective	5.1	46.2	7.7	30.8	10.3
Beginning	19.0	52.4	4.8	14.3	9.5
Experienced	22.0	36.0	6.0	24.0	12.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	5.1	46.2	7.7	30.8	10.3
26 - 50	16.7	66.7	--	16.7	--
51 - 75	25.0	58.3	--	16.7	--
76 - 100	20.8	34.0	7.5	22.6	15.1
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	18.0	47.5	4.9	26.2	3.3
U. of Calgary	12.2	36.7	8.2	22.4	20.4

Item 50. *I find it difficult to maintain student interest throughout a unit of study.*

The majority of the art teachers surveyed disagreed with the statement that maintaining student interest until the end of a unit was difficult (Table 52).

TABLE 52

ITEM 50
(in percentages)

	S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.
Total Sample	3.6	23.6	7.3	52.7	12.7
Experience Levels					
Prospective	--	25.6	5.1	56.4	12.8
Beginning	--	33.3	9.5	57.1	--
Experienced	8.0	18.0	8.0	48.0	18.0
Percentage Levels					
Prospective	--	25.6	5.1	56.4	12.8
26 - 50	16.7	33.3	--	33.3	16.7
51 - 75	16.7	8.3	8.3	58.3	8.3
76 - 100	1.9	24.5	9.4	50.9	13.2
University Attended					
U. of Alberta	4.9	31.1	4.9	50.8	8.2
U. of Calgary	2.0	14.3	10.2	55.1	18.4

SUMMARY OF SECTION C: CURRICULAR CONSIDERATIONS

Total Responses

Some concerns with student attitude were revealed in the responses to Items 37, 39, 44, and 46. An ambiguous split in responses by the total sample (moderate agreement and moderate disagreement) resulted from the statement that students seem to acknowledge the importance of an art program. A similar split resulted in responding to the statement that students are easy to motivate, with a slight preponderance to disagreement offered to that proposition. Largely moderate agreement was accorded the statement that some students show an interest in art outside of class time, and similar moderate agreement resulted from the statement that lack of co-operation from some students prohibits attempting some aspects of the curriculum.

Equal percentages of moderate agreement and strong disagreement resulted from the statement, "I find it hard to justify my system of grading" (Item 38), indicating that most art teachers appeared confident with whatever criteria they chose to employ in grading.

Philosophical considerations elicited the following results. High percentages of respondents within the total sample expressed strong to moderate agreement with the statement, "I believe that art can be taught in some measure to every student" (Item 40). Extremely strong support was also given to the proposition in that, considering outside programs, the art teachers still felt their programs had something unique to offer students. Strong to moderate agreement was indicated with the proposition that art is a difficult subject to teach.

Moderate to strong agreement was given to the proposition that it is difficult to differentiate instruction for gifted, poor, and average students. Similar results were gained from the statement, "I find that many of the higher achievers are channelled out of my classes in favour of other subjects" (Item 42).

The total sample registered moderate to strong disagreement with the idea that art is not considered an intellectual subject by their fellow teachers. A slight majority of teachers indicated, by their agreement with Item 45, that students seem to prefer "crafts" activities to areas such as drawing and painting.

Items dealing with program planning elicited both concern and confidence. Moderate agreement was given to the statement that it is hard to time the completion of one unit so as to make the transition to the next a smooth one for all students. However, moderate disagreement resulted from the statement, "I find it difficult to maintain student interest throughout a unit of study" (Item 50). These two items showed that while the total sample felt that timing and transition of units of study may be difficult to regulate, the interest of students is not hard to maintain.

Experience Levels

Differences between experience levels were found on two items dealing with student attitude. The notion that students acknowledge the importance of an art program brought more positive response from prospective art teachers than from practising art teachers. Lack of co-operation from some students was considered a particular problem by beginning teachers, as indicated by their greater agreement with Item 46: "Lack of co-operation from some students prohibits attempting some aspects of the curriculum." All experience level groups tended to disagree with the idea that students who enter art classes are easy to motivate, and agreed substantially that some students show an interest in art outside of class time.

All experience level groups disagreed that it was hard to justify their systems of grading. All strongly agreed that art can be taught in some measure to every student and that their programs had something unique to offer students. No significant differences occurred between these group responses on the proposition that art is a difficult subject to teach: all appeared agreed that it was difficult.

One significant difference arose between group responses on the topic of student types. Prospective teachers and experienced teachers disagreed that it was difficult to differentiate instruction for different student abilities, while beginning teachers gave a split response between moderate agreement and moderate to strong disagreement. No significant difference was found between these groups for the statement that higher achievers are channelled out of art classes in favour of other subjects: all seemed to believe that this was the case.

No significant differences were recorded between these groups for the statement that art is considered an intellectual subject by fellow teachers. The predominant feeling was that it was not.

Prospective teachers gave a highly neutral response to the statement that students seem to prefer "crafts" activities, while beginning teachers gave this proposal moderate to strong agreement and experienced teachers gave a split response. The response of prospective teachers probably indicated a lack of experience with an actual situation to enable them to judge such a perception. The beginning teachers perceived their students as preferring applied art forms over traditional forms such as drawing and painting, but this perception was upheld only by half the experienced respondents.

No significant differences were found between experience level groups on either of the items dealing with program planning.

Percentage Levels of Art Taught

Highly significant differences occurred between percentage level groups with regard to students' acknowledgement of the importance of an art program. Prospective teachers and those with full-time art indicated moderate agreement, but those with less than 76% art in their timetables were in strong agreement. No significant differences were found between these groups on Item 39--that art students are easy to motivate.

No significant differences occurred between percentage level groups on Items 39 and 44, but Item 46 revealed moderate agreement from every percentage level except those teachers with 51% to 75% art, who gave strong agreement with the statement, "Lack of co-operation from some students prohibits attempting some aspects of the curriculum."

Grading considerations brought no significant differences between percentage level groups, and no significant differences were found between these groups on items dealing with philosophy. Items containing references to types of students in art programs revealed no significant differences between these groups. The notion that art is considered an intellectual subject by fellow staff members brought similar levels of disagreement from all groups.

Some significance was found in the differences between percentage level groups on the item "students seem to prefer crafts activities to areas such as drawing and painting." Prospective teachers had a mixed response, with a high degree of neutrality. Teachers in the middle range of percentages of art (26% to 75%) gave split responses of strong agreement and moderate disagreement, while those with the most art gave moderate agreement that students preferred "crafts" activities.

No significant differences were found between the groups on the question of effecting transition and retaining student interest.

University Attended

No significant differences were found between the university groups on any items in Section C.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to arrive at a more adequate understanding of significant changes of perception about teaching in art which occur among teachers as their experience in the field increases. Specifically, the study was designed to describe the extent to which discontinuities appeared to exist among perceptions of the role of the art teacher held by art education students at the Universities of Calgary and Alberta, and those held by two groups of practising art teachers. Also, the study attempted to describe differences in perceptions held by art teachers who taught very little art in their timetables, and those whose art teaching load constituted all nor nearly all their teaching timetable. Comparison was made between perceptions of art teaching held by art teachers trained at the University of Alberta and those trained at the University of Calgary.

These matters formed the basis for the formulation of two questions:

1. How are some of the important matters affecting art teachers' well-being perceived by prospective teachers, beginning teachers, and experienced teachers?

2. May these differences in perception be attributable to

   (a) Length of experience of the art teacher?

   (b) Percentage of art taught by the art teacher?

(c) The institution attended for teacher training in art?

A summary of the findings, interpretation of the results, and implications for educational practice are contained in this chapter.

SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS

Problems Perceived in Art Teaching

The responses of the total sample were analysed to determine specific areas of art teaching where problems might be noted by art teachers. Items which received strongest reactions were noted and described for each of three sections within the questionnaire. These sections dealt with the working environment, human elements, and curricular considerations.

Section A: The Working Environment. Although the art teachers surveyed showed general satisfaction with the adequacy of their art teaching facilities, some indicated a definite need for more working space, and there was a definite need indicated for more storage space. A wide variation in responses on some items dealing with facilities probably reflected a variety of teaching situations being encountered by art personnel.

Preparation time was perceived as insufficient for the needs of a smoothly running art program. Although it is acknowledged that any teacher would consider more preparation time an asset to his program, it would be a mistake, in view of the large majority who agreed with the need for more such time, to dismiss their views as simply so much wishful thinking, without foundation as a real problem.

Teachers reacted with strong agreement to the proposition that there was a problem with students who wasted materials, indicating a distinct source of frustration in this regard. They also tended to support the notion that it was difficult to maintain a stock of supplies with their available budgets. This problem was further compounded by the very strong agreement given to the statement that it was difficult to get students to bring materials from home. These problems associated with materials are unique to the art situation, and were shown to be important concerns of many of the art teachers surveyed.

Strong feeling was indicated by a large majority of the art teachers in response to the idea that they were led into art education by a love of art. A love of children was considered a far less important motivating factor by the total sample. This discrepancy could be a potential source of problems for an art teacher who holds his subject area in high regard and finds, upon entering a real school situation, that others do not share his sentiment for his subject. Most indicated a measure of dedication to the teaching field, however, for they declared they would not have chosen another art career over teaching had such a career been available. This anomaly may be explained by the consideration that most people would have been reluctant to admit a wrong choice of professions, even though they were dissatisfied with their present one.

The total group of respondents tended to feel that lack of experience created particular problems for beginning teachers in art.

Section B: The Human Elements. The majority of art teachers surveyed indicated they had no regular contact with art supervisory personnel. They did indicate that they felt their efforts were supported by the art supervisor and his staff. It was not known how many respondents were from small school systems which had no art supervisory staff. It points to some interesting perceptions of the role of supervisory staff, however. Many of the respondents obviously did not see actual classroom visiting as part of the supervisor's task.

The total sample seemed to perceive that parents considered art an "easy" subject, which could lead to conflicts similar to those predicted by the art teacher's love of his subject area. Neither did most respondents perceive much support from their administrators in the pursuit of their own artistic interests. The high level of neutral responses to that item may suggest that art teachers do not consider it a matter which has direct relevance to their role as teacher. In the long run, however, it may be that parent and administrator indifference contributes to a feeling of alienation on the part of the art teacher.

Art teachers were united in their strong, positive response to the idea that they should not be required to teach subjects other than art. Since few situations in the province permit the exclusive teaching of art, many art teachers must be required to teach other subjects they have no desire to teach. One can imagine the consequences.

Strong support was given by the total sample to the proposition that most art classes were too large for a good art learning situation. This, too, must be a source of discouragement for the art teacher who has indicated that he feels his subject matter is important.

Some difference of opinion arose among the art teachers surveyed as to whether art departments were obliged to produce decorations and posters for organizations within the school. A slight preponderance of teachers disagreed that this obligation was incumbent upon them.

If other staff members and administrators feel that the art teacher ought to "pull his weight" by performing these tasks, and the art teacher for his part feels that such activities are not germane, conflict and friction are inevitable. Also, as reported by the total sample, if other teachers see the art teacher's job as "easy," the image of the art teacher could become, in consequence, even less favoured in the eyes of other staff members.

Art teachers seemed, in general, to feel that they could not take their own personal belongings, such as art objects, books, or materials to school, for fear of theft or vandalism by students. Finally, the total sample tended to disagree with the use of their art rooms by community groups in the evenings.

Section C: Curricular Considerations. Teachers reacted in a slightly negative way to the proposition that students who entered their classes were easy to motivate. Generally, they agreed that a lack of co-operation on the part of some students prohibited attempting some aspects of the curriculum. They also felt strongly that many of the higher achievers in their school were channelled out of their art classes in favour of other subjects. This perception, coupled with the feeling that art was not considered an intellectual subject by their fellow staff members, may serve to reduce the morale of art teachers and make them defensive about their subject area and their position on a school staff. The respondents agreed that they felt art was a difficult subject to teach: if it is not considered a particularly demanding subject to learn by students and staff, a discontinuity exists.

Slightly more than half the art teachers surveyed agreed that their students seemed to prefer "crafts" activities to those such as drawing and painting. Inquiries were not made into their curricular preferences, so it was not revealed whether the art teachers themselves also preferred "crafts" activities. However, the main substance of their training in art education at either university would have been in the traditional art forms of drawing, painting, and sculpture, so it seemed reasonable to assume these would have been the areas in which the majority of respondents were most knowledgeable.

Although the art teachers revealed that they had problems in timing the completion of one unit so as to make the transition to the next a smooth one for all students, they denied that they found difficulty in maintaining student interest throughout a unit of study.

Problems as Related to Experience Levels

The responses of the experience level groups (prospective, beginning, and experienced teachers) were compared to determine areas where significant differences existed between these groups. Items having significant differences were noted and described for each section.

Section A: The Working Environment. Three items dealing with facilities and one item in the realm of career considerations were perceived in significantly different ways by the different experience level groups.

Although all groups tended to agree that their art teaching facilities made it possible for them to present those portions of the curriculum they felt were most important, prospective teachers were most positive in their assessment of art teaching facilities as they perceived them. There seems little reason to assume, in view of such a result, that these teachers may enter their first classroom feeling already defeated.

The question of size of art areas brought an unusual set of responses. Beginning teachers felt most strongly that the size of their art area was inadequate. However, experienced teacher's responses were distributed across the scale, with a slight margin of strong disagreement, in contrast to the perceptions of the beginning teachers. These results probably reflect the nature of the working conditions for beginning teachers, who are usually located in the less favoured environments, and for experienced teachers, who tend to be rewarded with better situations.

The statement that lighting in the art area was sufficient for work was given moderate agreement by beginning and by experienced teacher groups. The strong consensus of both practicing teacher groups indicated that those teachers with actual situations to assess were completely satisfied with the lighting they encountered in their art areas.

A noteworthy difference in perception was recorded for the proposition that lack of experience was the cause of special problems during the art teacher's first years of teaching. This idea received high levels of agreement from both prospective and beginning teacher groups. Most experienced teachers, in retrospect, gave the proposition moderate agreement, but a group of those voicing a high level of disagreement indicated that a substantial number of experienced teachers did not remember their inexperience as such a great source of difficulty. Either times have changed, or time has blurred the memory of those early difficulties in the minds of the experienced respondents.

Section B: The Human Elements. Of the 20 items included in this section, 12 received significantly different responses from the experience level groups.

The items dealing with art supervisory personnel all received varying responses from the experience level groups. Significant differences may have resulted partly from the different types of urban and rural school systems included in the survey, and it is acknowledged that some respondents may not have had any art supervisory staff on which to base their reactions to these items. That the art supervisor and his staff might make regular contact with his art teachers was greeted with a moderate amount of disagreement from the prospective teacher group. Beginning teachers gave a divided response which may have implied that they had not yet arrived at a considered judgement about this question. Experienced teachers were very strong in their indication that they had little contact with art supervisory personnel. Beginning teachers again indicated their indecision in this regard by registering mostly neutral responses to the statement that the art supervisory staff supported their efforts. Neutrality was also the main response of experienced teachers who should have been able to make an informed judgement about their supervisor's support. Prospective teachers perceived in-service as seldom available, but practising teachers groups refuted this, giving strong support for the availability of in-service training for art teachers.

Prospective teachers indicated a belief that art fees would be a source of complaints from parents, while practising teacher groups disagreed with this perception, in greater numbers as experience increased.

Prospective teachers were of the opinion that their principals would speak out in support of their budget requests if these were questioned by other staff members. Practising teacher groups were essentially neutral on this item. Prospective teachers also indicated a belief that their administrators would encourage them in the pursuit of their own artistic interests; again, the practising teachers' responses ranged from neutral to disagreement, showing a completely different perception of their relationships with administrators than that held by teachers not yet in the field.

All groups felt classes were generally too large for good art learning, but the greatest difficulty with class size was noted by beginning teachers. Again, this might be construed as an item to which most teachers would be tempted to respond affirmatively. The interesting part of the response lies in the fact that beginning teachers seemed particularly sensitive to it.

Prospective teachers were mostly neutral in response to the statement, "The timetabling of this school has my support." Their reaction was predictable, considering their lack of a real situation.

The statement that "there are few serious discipline problems among art students" received the most emphatic agreement from experienced teachers and least agreement from beginning teachers. All groups, however, supported the statement to some degree.

Prospective teachers exhibited a far more positive attitude about the idea of bringing personal belongings to school for student use. Practising teacher groups strongly disagreed that this was a safe practice.

All groups agreed that participation in extra-curricular activities was part of any teacher's job, but this level of agreement diminished slightly with increased experience. One imagines that, despite the finding (noted elsewhere in this chapter) that most teachers felt their efforts were suitably acknowledged, they gradually became less inclined to give their time in the service of extra-curricular endeavours.

Section C: Curricular Considerations. Items about art program content resulted in four sets of significantly different responses from the experience level groups.

Prospective teachers were much more positive than the others that students seemed to acknowledge the importance of an art program. The practising teacher groups were split in response to that notion, and beginning teachers even indicated some strong feeling that students were totally unconvinced of art's importance. Beginning teachers appeared to encounter the greatest problem with lack of co-operation from students, and its effect on the curriculum they could present. Beginning teachers were the only group to show a substantial amount of agreement with the proposition that it was difficult to differentiate instruction to account for gifted, poor, and average art students. The other groups did not perceive this differentiation as a difficulty.

That students seemed to prefer "crafts" activities to drawing, painting, and sculpture, received substantial agreement from beginning teachers. The other experience level groups were split in response to this issue.

Problems as Related to Percentage of Art Taught

Percentage level groups comprised prospective teachers with no art teaching; teachers with 26% to 50% art in their timetables; teachers with 51% to 75% art in their timetables; and teachers with 76% to 100% art in their timetables: there were no respondents whose percentage of art fell within the 0 to 25% range. The responses of these groups were compared to determine areas where significant differences existed between groups. Items having significant differences were noted and described for each section.

Section A: The Working Environment. Three aspects of facilities and one of the career considerations generated significant differences between percentage level groups. Teachers in the 26% to 50% art group deviated sharply in their responses to the general statement that their art facilities made it possible to present the aspects of curriculum they thought were most important. Their reponse was strong disagreement, while all the other groups perceived that their facilities were generally adequate. It was suggested that perhaps teachers with such a small percentage of art may have been operating their programs in an area not designated as an art room. This suggestion has also been offered in explanation of the response of the same group to the statement that art areas were not of adequate size. They strongly supported this idea, as did those teachers with 76% to 100% art. For these latter, however, the reasons for their response were different. They probably sprang from greater expectations developed over years of art teaching (the 76% to 100% group was made up mainly of experienced teachers), and the greater work area requirements of their larger numbers of classes.

Prospective teachers were less positive in their agreement that lighting was sufficient than were the other percentage level groups. This difference in response was probably nothing more than a reflection of their lack of experience in their own classroom situation. In answer to another question, teacher groups with greater than 50% art expressed some disagreement with the idea that lack of experience was a source of problems for beginning teachers, while prospective teachers and those with less than 50% art felt that the statement was true.

Section B: The Human Elements. Many items in the section dealing with the human aspects of art teaching produced significant differences between percentage level groups. For example, different percentage levels registered different perceptions of in-service programs. Teachers with the least art in their timetables and those with all or nearly all art showed greatest recognition of the availability of in-service. Prospective teachers generally felt that in-service was seldom available.

The idea that parents might object to having art fees assessed seemed to be reduced as the percentage of art taught increased. Prospective teachers and those with the most art agreed that parents took an interest in their art programs, while the middle groups (26% to 75% art) strongly disagreed with this proposition.

School administration questions brought two instances of significant differences between groups. That principals supported art teachers' budget requests was answered by increasingly neutral responses as percentage levels of art increased, prompting speculation that this item was not a concern among full-time teachers of art. Teachers with 26% to 50% art strongly disagreed that administrators might encourage their pursuit of artistic interests outside of class time. Other groups remained neutral on this item, suggesting again that the item was not a concern of most art teachers.

Timetabling within the schools received different levels of support from each group, with an expected neutral response from prospective teachers who had no real situation to assess. Strong agreement, strong disagreement, and moderate agreement came from the 26% to 50% art group, the 51% to 75% art group, and the 76% to 100% art group, respectively. No general trend was evident from these results.

Teachers with smaller portions of art (26% to 75%) in their timetables seemed to perceive more discipline problems among their art students than did the other groups. This group differed sharply from the others regarding participation in extra-curricular activities. They disagreed that this was part of any teacher's responsibility, while all other groups agreed. The same group was substantially stronger in their support of the statement, "I receive commendation for extra projects undertaken by my department," than any of the other percentage level groups. This can be interpreted to suggest that, having undertaken art as a relatively small part of their teaching load, these teachers were particularly sensitive to any extra demands on their time which art activities might exercise.

Neutral responses were high among those groups with lesser amounts of art in response to the proposition that other teachers saw the art teacher's job as "easy." It was suggested that perhaps these groups did not perceive themselves as "art teachers" if they did not teach a full timetable of art classes.

The group of respondents not yet teaching art--the prospective teachers--was the most positive in its support of the practice of taking personal art books and belongings to school for student use. Other percentage level groups generally felt this was not a safe practice.

Section C: Curricular Considerations. Student attitude questions brought two significantly different sets of responses from percentage level groups. That students seemed to acknowledge the importance of an art program received little support from those teachers with lesser amounts of art (26% to 75%). More positive responses were received from prospective teachers and those with 76% to 100% art.

"Lack of co-operation from some students prohibits attempting some aspects of the curriculum," brought strong support from one group--those with 51% to 75% art. All other groups remained moderate in their agreement with the statement.

The responses of all groups varied markedly on the notion that students preferred "crafts" activities to drawing and painting. No general trend could be found among the divergent set of responses.

Discontinuities as Related to University Attended

The total number of 50 items in the questionnaire produced only four significantly different sets of responses through the comparison of the two university groups. It was assumed, therefore, that these significant differences were a result of chance and no attempt was made to construe any relationship between the significance of the items and the art education programs of the University of Calgary and the University of Alberta.

SUMMARY

In response to Question 1, "How are some of the important matters affecting art teachers' well-being perceived by prospective teachers, beginning teachers, and experienced teachers?," the following results were noted. With respect to the *total sample* of respondents surveyed, their responses indicated that:

1. Their working environment was generally adequate but there was a need for more working space, storage space, and preparation time.

2. There was a problem with wasted materials and with

maintenance of a good stock of supplies on the budget provided for this purpose, and it was difficult to get students to bring their own materials.

3. Their reason for entering the field of art education was a love of art rather than a love of children. However, they stated they would not have necessarily chosen another career in art had it been available.

4. They perceived lack of experience as a source of problems for beginning art teachers.

5. They experienced very little contact with art supervisory personnel, but expressed a feeling that this group supported their efforts.

6. Parents considered art an "easy" subject.

7. They should not be required to teach subjects other than art.

8. Most classes were too large.

9. Other teachers saw their job as "easy."

10. They could not safely take personal belongings such as art books and materials to school for the use of art students.

11. They disagreed with the practice of community groups using their classrooms in the evenings.

12. A lack of co-operation on the part of some students was prohibitive to undertaking some aspects of the curriculum.

13. Many of the higher achievers among students within the school were channelled out of their classes.

14. Art was not considered an intellectual subject by their

fellow teachers.

15. There were problems in timing the completion of one unit to facilitate a smooth transition to the next.

In response to Question 2(a): "May these differences in perception be attributable to the length of experience of the art teacher?" the following results were noted:

1. Prospective teachers were more positive than other experience level groups that existing art facilities were adequate for the presentation of all the aspects of the art program they considered important.

2. Beginning teachers generally perceived the size of their art areas as inadequate for efficient work.

3. Experienced teachers perceived the size of their art areas as adequate.

4. Prospective and beginning teachers saw lack of experience as a source of problems for beginning teachers.

5. Prospective teachers only were confident of regular contact with art supervisory personnel.

6. Prospective teachers only perceived that in-service programs were seldom available: other groups, however, disagreed.

7. Prospective teachers only perceived the charging of art fees as a potential cause of complaints from parents.

8. Prospective teachers only felt that principals would support their budge requests to other staff members: all other groups were generally neutral.

9. Prospective teachers only believed that administrators would

encourage them in their own artistic pursuits.

10. Beginning teachers appeared to perceive the greatest difficulty with large classes.

11. Beginning teachers encountered the greatest difficulty with discipline problems among art students.

12. Prospective teachers only believed that bringing personal belongings such as art books and materials to school was a safe practice.

13. Prospective teachers were most inclined to place responsibility for extra-curricular activities with the teacher.

14. Prospective teachers believed that students acknowledged the importance of an art program: beginning teachers felt that this was not the case.

15. Beginning teachers were most inclined to feel that lack of co-operation from students could interfere with full curriculum implementation.

16. Beginning teachers perceived the greatest difficulty in differentiating instruction to take account of gifted, poor, and average students.

17. Beginning teachers tended to suggest that students preferred "crafts" activities to those such as drawing and painting.

In response to Question 2(b): "May these differences in perception be attributable to the percentage of art taught by the art teacher?," the following results were noted from *group responses:*

1. Those teaching 26% to 50% art disagreed that their art facilities were adequate.

2. Those teaching 26% to 50% art and 76% to 100% art felt that their art areas were inadequate in size.

3. Those teaching 51% to 75% and 76% to 100% tended to disagree that lack of experience was a source of problems for beginning teachers.

4. Those teaching 26% to 50% art and 51% to 75% art disagreed that parents took an interest in their art programs.

5. Those teaching 26% to 50% art strongly disagreed that the administration would encourage their own artistic pursuits.

6. Those teaching 26% to 50% art perceived slightly more discipline problems than did the other groups.

7. Those teaching 26% to 50% art disagreed that participation in extra-curricular activities was part of any teacher's responsibility.

8. Those teaching 26% to 50% art appeared most aware of commendation received for extra projects undertaken by the art department.

9. Those teaching 26% to 50% art and 51% to 75% art perceived that students did not acknowledge the importance of an art program.

10. Those teaching 51% to 75% art strongly agreed that lack of co-operation from some students prohibited implementation of some aspects of the curriculum.

In response to Question 2(c): "May these differences in perception be attributable to the institution attended for teaching training in art?," a single conclusion was made. Of the 50 items, only four received significantly different responses from the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary groups. Therefore, the significant differences on these few items were attributed to chance and it was assumed that the institution attended had no effect on the respondents' perception of discontinuities.

The responses of the sample to the 50 items of the questionnaire were compared to test the three null hypotheses formulated from Question 2. Results were as follows:

$H_0$1: There are no significant differences between three groups of art teachers (prospective, beginning, and experienced teachers) in their perceptions of matters affecting art teachers' well-being.

Of the 50 items correlated, 20 resulted in significant differences between the groups. The hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level. It was established that there were significant differences between the perceptions of the role of an art teacher as seen by prospective, beginning, and experienced teachers of art.

$H_0$2: There are no significant differences between teachers engaged in teaching art for differing percentages of time, in their perceptions of matters affecting art teachers' well-being.

Of the 50 items correlated, 20 resulted in significant differences between the groups. The hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level. It was established that there were significant differences between the perceptions of the role of an art teacher as seen by teachers whose timetables included different percentages of art classes.

$H_0$3: There are no significant differences between art teachers who have graduated from the two major teacher training institutions in Alberta in their perceptions of matters affecting art teachers' well-being.

Of the 50 items correlated, four resulted in significant differences between the groups. The hypothesis was therefore rejected. However, if one examines these responses logically rather than statistically, there seems little reason to believe that these differences could be attributable to substantive factors. For practical purposes, differences between the university samples were negligible.

IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

This study has served to reinforce some enduring beliefs of art educators in Alberta. It has dealt with some areas of great concern among a sample of the art teachers in the province who have been trained by and for the Alberta education system. The findings have revealed a number of areas where perceptions differ between experience levels of art teachers and between art teachers who are given various amounts of art to teach. The results of the study have served, to some extent, to support the commonalities between the two major institutions of art teacher training in the province.

The problem areas revealed in the responses of the total group are not startling to anyone connected with the field of art education. They have been discussed in the literature, at formal conferences, and at informal gatherings of art educators for many years. They will continue to be considered and discussed as long as art education remains low in priority within the educational scheme.

These general concerns of art teachers, for the purpose of this study, were established as a tally list against which the concerns of various sub-groups of art teachers could be checked. It is also important that those areas of most concern to art teachers be registered periodically, to keep them visible to those who may be in positions to effect curriculum change. Changes in these areas of concern over time also serve as a barometer for the state of art within the province.

The major implications of this study were revealed in comparing concerns between the experience levels of art teachers. The results of this comparison indicated that prospective teachers held many perceptions of art teaching that differed vastly from those held by beginning teachers. They perceived the situation of an art teacher in relation to his facilities, students, administrators, peers, and curricular expectations far more positively than did the teachers in their first few years of practice.

The highest number of significant concerns among beginning teachers were found in the area of human relations, where the most delicate and unpredictable situations occur in teaching. Experienced teachers, on the other hand, seemed to have come to terms with their art teaching situations, have developed a realistic set of perceptions and modified expectations, and now expressed their concerns less negatively than did the beginning teachers. It is also important to note here that the percentage of teachers in the experienced category, who were also in the 76% to 100% art teaching category, was 74%, suggesting that most of the experienced teachers had gained the type of art teaching situation best suited to them, where their needs and priorities were met and their expectations satisfied.

The relevant literature and this study have concurred that prospective teachers hold a series of beliefs and expectations not necessarily congruent with the real world of art teaching. Perhaps more practicum experience would dispel some of these unrealistic perceptions of the life of an art teacher which they still hold following their limited experience of student teaching. It has also been shown, however, that these prospective teachers do not consider themselves actual teachers as yet, and the protection offered by the "student" prefix to their teacher title, coupled with their strong connection with the university may inhibit their acceptance of the art teaching situation as it actually exists. This barrier against reality is buttressed by the hope maintained by every prospective teacher that he can circumvent all the problems and vexations reputed to exist by attaining a "good" teaching position. Also, in practice teaching, solutions to problems are instantly available through faculty advisors or co-operating teachers.

It seems that the place to attack the discontinuity crisis is at the beginning teacher level. Here, the teachers have been brought face-to-face with the realities they denied as idealistic student teachers. They are not only forced to accept these realities but must deal with them on a day-to-day basis. If, as the literature suggests, they will eventually transcend this period of disillusionment, it seems reasonable to propose that many careers in art teaching may be saved by creating a system which would lessen the shock of leaving the unreal university world and entering the very real teaching world where the situation of art teaching at its worst is often handed to the beginning teacher, the one least prepared to take it. Given that very few experienced teachers are prepared to leave the more comfortable positions they have attained through their years of service to take difficult teaching positions off the shoulders of beginning teachers, these novices should be given some assistance in these first teaching situations, by the universities that prepared them, the administrators who have placed them in those positions, and the experienced teachers who have coped and survived. It is recommended, on the strength of the findings of this study, that an in-service program for beginning teachers be established to help these teachers achieve the goals and meet the expectations which have led them into art teaching. This move would provide another means of easing the transition between prospective and beginning art teacher stages. The findings suggest a system of internship teaching which would allow the novice to shoulder gradually the responsibilities of art teaching, handling his organizational, budgetary, and disciplinary problems under the aegis of a more experienced fellow-professional.

A major implication arising from the results of the comparison between percentage level groups is that those who teach less than 50% art do not consider themselves truly art teachers. This suggestion was revealed by the strong differences in the perceptions offered by the 26% to 50% art group in many cases throughout the questionnaire. It was acknowledged that this group consisted of only six of the 110 respondents and, thus, their deviant responses may not be as important as indicated by the correlations of percentages of response groups.

Art teaching situations varied greatly among the percentage level groups: those teachers with higher percentages of art enjoyed higher quality facilities with which to teach art. This variation in facilities suggests that any in-service program designed to aid first and second year art teachers with their teaching problems must be flexible enough to suggest several types of solutions to any given problem, for it has been revealed that many different levels of facilities for art teaching exist. Any program developed to help beginning art teachers must first examine the problems and priorities of the individual novice teacher, and then suggest sample solutions in consideration of unique situations.

Here is where experienced teachers may be utilized. Their years of experience must somewhere hold a similar situation and the means of handling it, and the record of their success would hearten the novice who has no previous success of his own to support him.

The results of this comparison may have been unnecessarily complicated by the inclusion of the prospective teacher group who taught no art. However, their limited experience as student teachers was reflected in their responses, and the nature of these provides some useful information on the state of mind of the embryo teacher.

This study has not broken new ground, or attempted to give a new direction to art education. It has, however, reinforced a number of beliefs which are in common circulation but which until now have had no hard data to support them. It has also provided some indirect evidence of the extent to which prospective and practising teachers of art in the province of Alberta are satisfied with their present condition.

REFERENCES CITED

Beymer, Rosemary. On teacher training. *Art Education,* 23:1, January, 1970, 36-37.

Charters, W. W., Jr. The social background of teaching. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching.* Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1963.

Combs, A. W. *The professional education of teachers.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1965. Cited in R. Beymer, On teacher training, *Art Education,* 23:1, January, 1970, 36.

Cooper, James M., & Kevin Ryan. *Those who can, teach.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1972.

Day, Michael. Rationales for art education: Thinking through and telling why. *Art Education,* 25:2, February, 1972, 17-20.

Dorn, Charles M. The silent seventies? *Art Education,* 25:1, January, 1972, 22-28.

Dutton, Wilbur H., & Evan R. Keislar. Attitudes towards teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education,* June, 1961. Cited in F. R. Schwartz, The undergraduate training of an art teacher, *School Arts,* 64:6, February, 1965, 36-38.

Eisner, Elliott W. The promise of teacher education. *Art Education,* 25:3, March, 1972, 10-14.

Engel, Martin. The continuing education of teachers of the arts. *Art Education,* 29:5, September, 1976, 4-9.

Fuller, Frances F. Effects of personalized feedback during teacher preparation on teacher personality and teaching behavior. Austin: University of Texas, 1969. (Mimeographed)

Fuchs, Estelle. *Teachers' talk: Views from inside city schools.* New York: Doubleday, 1969.

Geiss, Elizabeth. Toward art teachers of quality. *Art Education,* 25:7, October, 1972, 10-13.

Hannam, C., P. Smythe, & N. Stephenson. *The first year of teaching.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976.

Hatfield, Thomas A. The school administrator: The art teacher's approach. *Art Education,* 25:4, April, 1972, 21-23.

Hubbard, Guy. *Art in the high school.* Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1967.

Jefferson, Brian T. The visualization centers program: A response to the teaching surplus. *Art Education,* 9:25, December, 1972, 16-17.

Joyce, B. R., & M. Weil. *Models of teaching.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Kass, H., & A. Wheeler. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education. Edmonton, Alta.: University of Alberta, 1975. (Mimeographed)

Knoblock, P., & A. P. Goldstein. *The lonely teacher.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971.

Lanier, Vincent. Objectives of teaching art. *Art Education,* 25:3, 1972, 15-19.

Levy, David C. Creativity and the new teacher. *Art Education,* 25:7, October, 1972, 6-9.

Maul, Ray C. Teacher supply and demand in art education. *Art Education,* 17:9, December, 1964, 24-27.

McFee, June King. *Preparation for art.* San Francisco, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1961.

Miller, V. I., & W. E. Hodgson. A study of the factors which determine success or failure among beginning teachers in the Province of Alberta. Report presented to the Research Committee, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1953.

Milne, John L. Problems of first-year teachers in an urban school system. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1968.

Musgrove, F., & P. H. Taylor. *Society and the teacher's role.* London: Routledge & Kegan-Paul, 1969.

National Art Education Association. Guidelines for teacher preparation. *Art Education,* 23:6, June, 1970, 9-11.

Neufeld, Joseph S. A study of teacher attitudes and open-mindedness of student teachers. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1971.

Peck, Robert F. (Ed.). *Personality factors on the college campus.* Austin: University of Texas, 1962.

Schwartz, Fred R. The undergraduate training of an art teacher. *School Arts,* 64:6, February, 1965, 36-38.

Schwartz, Fred R. *Structure and potential in art education.* Toronto:

Ginn-Blaisdell, 1970.

Smith, B. Othaniel (in collaboration with S. B. Cohen and A. Pearl). *Teachers for the real world.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

Smitheram, V., et al. *Teacher education: Perseverance or professionalism.* Charlottetown, P.E.I.: University of Prince Edward Island, Committee on Teacher Education, 1971.

Spindler, George D. *Education and culture: Anthropological approaches.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.

Stinnet, T. M. (Ed.). *The teacher dropout.* Report of a symposium sponsored by the Commission on Strengthening the Teaching Profession, Phi Delta Kappa. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 1972.

Thelen, Herbert A. From individual behavior to classroom activity: An inquiry into art education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 3:2, 1971, 135-158.

Triandes, H. C. *Attitude and attitude change.* New York: Wiley and Sons, 1971.

Vitoria, J. Art and the open classroom. *Art Education,* 25:6, June, 1972, 17-19.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

QUESTIONNAIRE: ART TEACHERS

The following questionnaire has been organized so that a minimum of your time will be required to answer the questions. It is designed to examine some of the areas of concern in art teaching. Please react to each item as you feel it applies to your own situation.

All questions should be answered by circling the appropriate degree of agreement on the scale as below:

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neutral	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

which will be indicated by the initials:

S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.

Please avoid the Neutral position unless the item does not actually apply to your situation.

Thank you for your co-operation.

SECTION A

FOR
RESEARCH
USE ONLY

1. My art teaching facilities make it possible for me to present all those aspects of the art program that I think are important. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

2. My art area does not have adequate size for efficient work. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

3. My art area has sufficient lighting for work. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

4. I do not have sufficient teacher preparation time to have a smoothly running art program. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

5. There is little problem with students who waste materials. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

6. My storage areas are not sufficient for my purposes. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

7. I receive little co-operation when my art area needs repairs or renovations. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

8. Class time is not long enough to ensure adequate working and clean-up time. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

9. I find it difficult to maintain a stock of supplies on the budget given. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

10. I have adequate clean-up facilities. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

FOR
RESEARCH
USE ONLY

11. I find it difficult to get students to bring materials from home. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

12. I expect to remain at the same school for several years. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

13. I chose art education as a field because of my love of art. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

14. I chose art education as a field because of my love of children. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

15. I feel my lack of experience creates special problems during my first years of teaching. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

16. If another career in art had been available to me, I would have pursued it rather than teaching. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

SECTION B

17. The Art Supervisor and art staff of Central Office contact me regularly. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

18. The art staff of my Board does not seem to support my efforts. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

19. I have the full co-operation of the caretaking staff. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

FOR
RESEARCH
USE ONLY

20. Any art fee charged to my students creates complaints from parents. _______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

21. My principal supports my budget requests when other teachers ask for justification of them. _______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

22. Most or all of my classes are too large for a good art learning situation. _______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

23. I feel the art department has no obligation to make posters and decorations for other school organizations. _______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

24. The administration appreciates that there are particular circumstances to be considered in running an art program. _______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

25. I should not be expected to teach other subjects besides art. _______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

26. I feel that I can safely bring my own books, art objects, and materials to school without fear of theft or vandalism. _______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

27. I am encouraged by the administration to pursue my own artistic interests outside of class time. _______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

28. The timetabling of this school has my support. _______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

FOR
RESEARCH
USE ONLY

29. Parents of my students seem to take an interest in the art program I am offering their children. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

30. Other staff members see my job as "easy." ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

31. I approve of the use of my classroom by community groups in the evening. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

32. Helpful in-service programs are seldom offered by my Board for art teachers. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

33. I have few serious discipline problems with art students. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

34. I see participation in extra-curricular activities as part of any teacher's responsibility. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

35. I receive commendation for extra projects undertaken by my department. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

36. I believe that the parents of my students see art as an "easy" subject. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

SECTION C

37. The students seem to acknowledge the importance of an art program. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

FOR
RESEARCH
USE ONLY

38. I find it hard to justify my system of grading. ______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

39. Students who enter my classes are easy to motivate. ______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

40. I believe that art can be taught in some measure to every student. ______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

41. I find it difficult to differentiate my instruction to take account of gifted, poor, and average students. ______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

42. I find that many of the higher achievers are channelled out of my classes in favour of other subjects. ______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

43. Art is considered an intellectual subject by my fellow staff members. ______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

44. Some students show an interest in art outside of class time. ______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

45. Students seem to prefer "crafts" activities to areas such as drawing, painting, and sculpture. ______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

46. Lack of co-operation from some students prohibits attempting some aspects of the art curriculum. ______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

47. I find it hard to time the completion of one unit so as to make the transition to the next a smooth one for all students. ______

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

FOR
RESEARCH
USE ONLY

48. Taking outside programs (e.g. Community League activity) into consideration, I still feel my program has something unique to offer the students. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

49. I feel art is a difficult subject to teach. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

50. I find it difficult to maintain student interest throughout a unit of study. ________

S.A. M.A. N. M.D. S.D.

APPENDIX B

Transmittal Letter

To the Art Teacher:

The enclosed questionnaire has been designed to gather information about the concerns of art teachers. The information gathered will form part of a thesis for a Master of Education degree. It will be distributed after analysis to the participating school boards and universities as well as the A.T.A. Fine Arts Council.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would complete the questionnaire and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope as soon as possible. No written comments are required and all answers will be kept confidential. Your name is not required, but the following biographical information is necessary for purposes of comparison.

Degree held: ______________________________

Institution where Art Education training took place:

____

Number of years of teaching experience: ____________

Art Education (or Art) is my major field of teacher training:

Yes No (circle one)

Percentage of art in my timetable (circle one):

Less than 25% 26% - 50% 51% - 75% 76% - 100%

Additional information and comments are welcomed and can be included on the back of this sheet. Thank you for your help and co-operation.

Sincerely,

Ann E. Wolfe

APPENDIX C

Section A
(Tables 53-61)

TABLE 53

SECTION A: TOTAL RESPONSES

(N = 110)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.
1	Raw	18	53	--	23	16
	%	16.4	48.2	--	20.9	14.5
2	Raw	31	33	3	20	23
	%	28.2	30.0	2.7	18.2	20.9
3	Raw	41	47	1	13	8
	%	37.3	42.7	0.9	11.8	7.3
4	Raw	24	43	5	24	14
	%	21.8	39.1	4.5	21.8	12.7
5	Raw	8	25	2	45	30
	%	7.3	22.7	1.8	40.9	27.3
6	Raw	36	42	2	19	11
	%	32.7	38.2	1.8	17.3	10.0
7	Raw	17	30	9	36	18
	%	15.5	27.3	8.2	32.7	16.4
8	Raw	31	20	9	26	24
	%	28.2	18.2	8.2	23.6	21.8
9	Raw	30	32	5	27	16
	%	27.3	29.1	4.5	24.5	14.5
10	Raw	16	37	8	25	24
	%	14.5	33.6	7.3	22.7	21.8
11	Raw	51	36	5	17	1
	%	46.4	32.7	4.5	15.5	0.9
12	Raw	18	35	24	16	17
	%	16.4	31.8	21.8	14.5	15.5
13	Raw	80	25	1	2	1
	%	73.4	22.9	0.9	1.8	0.9
14	Raw	23	49	14	17	6
	%	21.1	45.0	12.8	15.6	5.5
15	Raw	20	48	10	15	16
	%	18.3	44.0	9.2	13.8	14.7
16	Raw	12	20	24	38	15
	%	11.0	18.3	22.0	34.9	13.8

TABLE 54

SECTION A: EXPERIENCE LEVELS, PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

(N = 39)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
1	Raw	2	22	--	12	3		
	%	5.1	56.4	--	30.8	7.7	13.31	.0384
2	Raw	6	21	1	7	4		
	%	15.4	53.8	2.6	17.9	10.3	25.86	.0011
3	Raw	8	19	--	10	2		
	%	20.5	48.7	--	25.6	5.1	20.57	.0084
4	Raw	12	1	9	6			
	%	28.2	30.8	2.6	23.1	15.4	5.47	.7068
5	Raw	4	7	1	18	9		
	%	10.3	17.9	2.6	46.2	23.1	10.37	.2403
6	Raw	11	18	2	7	1		
	%	28.2	46.2	5.1	17.9	2.6	13.58	.0933
7	Raw	7	12	5	13	2		
	%	17.9	30.8	12.8	33.3	5.1	11.67	.1666
8	Raw	15	10	3	8	3		
	%	38.5	25.6	7.7	20.5	7.7	10.85	.2103
9	Raw	10	16	2	9	2		
	%	25.6	41.0	5.1	23.1	5.1	7.97	.4368
10	Raw	2	18	4	11	4		
	%	5.1	46.2	10.3	28.2	10.3	13.71	.0897
11	Raw	12	16	1	9	1		
	%	30.8	41.0	2.6	23.1	2.6	12.44	.1326
12	Raw	4	10	8	10	7		
	%	10.3	25.6	20.5	25.6	17.9	10.61	.2246
13	Raw	27	10	--	1	--		
	%	71.7	26.3	--	2.6	--	3.44	.9041
14	Raw	8	19	4	5	2		
	%	21.1	50.0	10.5	13.2	5.3	5.92	.6559
15	Raw	13	18	2	4	1		
	%	34.2	47.4	5.3	10.5	2.6	21.28	.0064
16	Raw	5	5	7	15	6		
	%	13.2	13.2	18.4	39.5	15.8	9.96	.2677

TABLE 55

SECTION A: EXPERIENCE LEVELS, BEGINNING TEACHERS

(N = 21)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
1	Raw	3	8	--	5	5		
	%	14.3	38.1	--	23.8	23.8	13.31	.0384
2	Raw	12	2	--	3	4		
	%	57.1	9.5	--	14.3	19.0	25.86	.0011
3	Raw	9	7	1	2	2		
	%	42.9	33.3	4.8	9.5	9.5	20.57	.0084
4	Raw	2	9	2	5	3		
	%	9.5	42.9	9.5	23.8	14.3	5.47	.7068
5	Raw	1	4	--	5	11		
	%	4.8	19.0	--	23.8	52.4	10.37	.2403
6	Raw	10	3	--	5	3		
	%	47.6	14.3	--	23.8	14.3	13.58	.0933
7	Raw	3	8	1	7	2		
	%	14.3	38.1	4.8	33.3	9.5	11.67	.1666
8	Raw	6	3	2	4	6		
	%	28.6	14.3	9.5	19.0	28.6	10.85	.2103
9	Raw	7	4	1	6	3		
	%	33.3	19.0	4.8	28.6	14.3	7.97	.4368
10	Raw	5	4	2	5	5		
	%	23.8	19.0	9.5	23.8	23.8	13.71	.0897
11	Raw	14	6	1	--	--		
	%	66.7	28.6	4.8	--	--	12.44	.1326
12	Raw	2	9	4	2	4		
	%	9.5	42.9	19.0	9.5	19.0	10.61	.2246
13	Raw	17	4	--	--	--		
	%	81.0	19.0	--	--	--	3.44	.9041
14	Raw	2	13	2	3	1		
	%	9.5	61.9	9.5	14.3	4.8	5.92	.6559
15	Raw	4	10	1	4	2		
	%	19.0	47.6	4.8	19.0	9.5	21.28	.0064
16	Raw	2	1	5	11	2		
	%	9.5	4.8	23.8	52.4	9.5	9.96	.2677

TABLE 56

SECTION A: EXPERIENCE LEVELS, EXPERIENCED TEACHERS
(N = 50)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N.	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
1	Raw	13	23	--	6	8		
	%	26.0	46.0	--	12.0	16.0	13.31	.0384
2	Raw	13	10	2	10	15		
	%	26.0	20.0	4.0	20.0	30.0	25.86	.0011
3	Raw	24	21	--	1	4		
	%	48.0	42.0	--	2.0	8.0	20.57	.0084
4	Raw	11	22	2	10	5		
	%	22.0	44.0	4.0	20.0	10.0	5.47	.7068
5	Raw	3	14	1	22	10		
	%	6.0	28.0	2.0	44.0	20.0	10.37	.2403
6	Raw	15	21	--	7	7		
	%	30.0	42.0	--	14.0	14.0	13.58	.0933
7	Raw	7	10	3	16	14		
	%	14.0	20.0	6.0	32.0	28.0	11.67	.1666
8	Raw	10	7	4	14	15		
	%	20.0	14.0	8.0	28.0	30.0	10.85	.2103
9	Raw	13	13	2	12	11		
	%	26.0	24.0	4.0	24.0	22.0	7.97	.4368
10	Raw	9	15	2	9	15		
	%	18.0	30.0	4.0	18.0	30.0	13.71	.0897
11	Raw	25	14	3	8	--		
	%	50.0	28.0	6.0	16.0	--	12.44	.1326
12	Raw	12	16	12	4	6		
	%	24.0	32.0	24.0	8.0	12.0	10.61	.2246
13	Raw	36	11	1	1	1		
	%	72.0	22.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.44	.9041
14	Raw	13	17	8	9	3		
	%	26.0	34.0	16.0	18.0	6.0	5.92	.6559
15	Raw	3	20	7	7	13		
	%	6.0	40.0	14.0	14.0	26.0	21.28	.0064
16	Raw	5	14	12	12	7		
	%	10.0	28.0	24.0	24.0	14.0	9.96	.2677

TABLE 57

SECTION A: PERCENTAGE OF ART TAUGHT, PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

(N = 39)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
1	Raw	2	22	--	12	3		
	%	5.1	56.4	--	30.8	7.7	20.86	.0133
2	Raw	6	21	1	7	4		
	%	15.4	53.8	2.6	17.9	10.3	30.04	.0028
3	Raw	8	19	--	10	2		
	%	20.5	48.7	--	25.6	5.1	28.44	.0048
4	Raw	11	12	1	9	6		
	%	28.2	30.8	2.6	23.1	15.4	11.90	.4539
5	Raw	4	7	1	18	9		
	%	10.3	17.9	2.6	46.2	23.1	5.80	.9256
6	Raw	11	18	2	7	1		
	%	28.2	46.2	5.1	17.9	2.6	12.7	.3876
7	Raw	7	12	5	13	2		
	%	17.9	30.8	12.8	33.3	5.1	11.95	.4496
8	Raw	15	10	3	8	3		
	%	38.5	25.6	7.7	20.5	7.7	18.46	.1025
9	Raw	10	16	2	9	2		
	%	25.6	41.0	5.1	23.1	5.1	17.01	.1494
10	Raw	2	18	4	11	4		
	%	5.1	46.2	10.3	28.2	10.3	18.15	.1112
11	Raw	12	16	1	9	1		
	%	30.8	41.0	2.6	23.1	2.6	12.84	.3807
12	Raw	4	10	8	10	7		
	%	10.3	25.6	20.5	25.6	17.9	18.50	.1015
13	Raw	27	10	--	1	--		
	%	71.1	26.3	--	2.6	--	11.36	.4985
14	Raw	8	19	4	5	2		
	%	21.1	50.0	10.5	13.2	5.3	10.86	.5411
15	Raw	13	18	2	4	1		
	%	34.2	47.4	5.3	10.5	2.6	22.13	.0361
16	Raw	5	5	7	15	6		
	%	13.2	13.2	18.4	39.5	15.8	8.45	.7494

TABLE 58

SECTION A: PERCENTAGE OF ART TAUGHT, 26% to 50%

(N = 6)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
1	Raw	1	--	--	3	2		
	%	16.7	--	--	50.0	33.3	20.86	.0133
2	Raw	2	1	1	1	1		
	%	33.3	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7	30.04	.0028
3	Raw	3	2	--	--	1		
	%	50.0	33.3	--	--	16.7	28.44	.0048
4	Raw	3	1	--	2	--		
	%	50.0	16.7	--	33.3	--	11.90	.4539
5	Raw	--	1	--	3	2		
	%	--	16.7	--	50.0	33.3	5.80	.9256
6	Raw	3	1	--	1	1		
	%	50.0	16.7	--	16.7	16.7	12.75	.3876
7	Raw	1	2	1	1	1		
	%	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.7	16.7	11.95	.4496
8	Raw	2	1	1	--	2		
	%	33.3	16.7	16.7	--	33.3	18.46	.1025
9	Raw	1	2	1	2	--		
	%	16.7	33.3	16.7	33.3	--	17.01	.1494
10	Raw	2	1	1	--	2		
	%	33.3	16.7	16.7	--	33.3	18.15	.1112
11	Raw	4	2	--	--	--		
	%	66.7	33.3	--	--	--	12.84	.3807
12	Raw	2	2	1	1	--		
	%	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	--	18.50	.1015
13	Raw	4	1	--	1	--		
	%	66.7	16.7	--	16.7	--	11.36	.4984
14	Raw	--	2	2	2	--		
	%	--	33.3	33.3	33.3	--	10.86	.5411
15	Raw	1	4	1	--	--		
	%	16.7	66.7	16.7	--	--	22.13	.0361
16	Raw	2	1	2	1	--		
	%	33.3	16.7	33.3	16.7	--	8.45	.7494

TABLE 59

SECTION A: PERCENTAGE OF ART TAUGHT, 51% to 75%

(N = 12)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
1	Raw	1	6	--	3	2		
	%	8.3	50.0	--	25.0	16.7	20.86	.0133
2	Raw	2	4	1	3	2		
	%	16.7	33.3	8.3	25.0	16.7	30.04	.0028
3	Raw	2	10	--	--	--		
	%	16.7	83.3	--	--	--	28.44	.0048
4	Raw	1	6	--	4	1		
	%	8.3	50.0	--	33.3	8.3	11.90	.4539
5	Raw	--	4	--	3	5		
	%	--	33.3	--	25.0	41.7	5.80	.9256
6	Raw	4	6	--	--	2		
	%	33.3	50.0	--	--	16.7	12.75	.3876
7	Raw	3	3	1	4	1		
	%	25.0	25.0	8.3	33.3	8.3	11.95	.4496
8	Raw	--	1	1	6	4		
	%	--	8.3	8.3	50.0	33.3	18.46	.1025
9	Raw	5	--	--	5	2		
	%	41.7	--	--	41.7	16.7	17.01	.1494
10	Raw	1	4	--	2	5		
	%	8.3	33.3	--	16.7	41.7	18.15	.1112
11	Raw	8	1	1	2	--		
	%	66.7	8.3	8.3	16.7	--	12.84	.3807
12	Raw	1	4	1	1	5		
	%	8.3	33.3	8.3	8.3	41.7	18.50	.1015
13	Raw	10	2	--	--	--		
	%	83.3	16.7	--	--	--	11.36	.4985
14	Raw	2	6	--	2	2		
	%	16.7	50.0	--	16.7	16.7	10.86	.5411
15	Raw	--	6	2	1	3		
	%	--	50.0	16.7	8.3	25.0	22.13	.0361
16	Raw	2	2	2	4	2		
	%	16.7	16.7	16.7	33.3	16.7	8.45	.7494

TABLE 60

SECTION A: PERCENTAGE OF ART TAUGHT, 76% to 100%

(N = 53)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
1	Raw	14	25	--	5	9		
	%	26.4	47.2	--	9.4	17.0	20.86	.0133
2	Raw	21	7	--	9	16		
	%	39.6	13.2	--	17.0	30.2	30.04	.0028
3	Raw	28	16	1	3	5		
	%	52.8	30.2	1.9	5.7	9.4	28.44	.0048
4	Raw	9	24	4	9	7		
	%	17.0	45.3	7.5	17.0	13.2	11.90	.4539
5	Raw	4	13	1	21	14		
	%	7.5	24.5	1.9	39.6	26.4	5.80	.9256
6	Raw	18	17	--	11	7		
	%	34.0	32.1	--	20.8	13.2	12.75	.3876
7	Raw	6	13	2	18	14		
	%	11.3	24.5	3.8	34.0	26.4	11.95	.4496
8	Raw	14	8	4	12	15		
	%	26.4	15.1	7.5	22.6	28.3	18.46	.1025
9	Raw	14	14	2	11	12		
	%	26.4	26.4	3.8	20.8	22.6	17.01	.1494
10	Raw	11	14	3	12	13		
	%	20.8	26.4	5.7	22.6	24.5	18.15	.1112
11	Raw	27	17	3	6	--		
	%	50.9	32.1	5.7	11.3	--	12.84	.3807
12	Raw	11	19	14	4	5		
	%	20.8	35.8	26.4	7.5	9.4	18.50	.1015
13	Raw	39	12	1	--	1		
	%	73.6	22.6	1.9	--	1.9	11.36	.4985
14	Raw	13	22	8	8	2		
	%	24.5	41.5	15.1	15.1	3.8	10.86	.5411
15	Raw	6	20	5	10	12		
	%	11.3	37.7	9.4	18.9	22.6	22.13	.0361
16	Raw	3	12	13	18	7		
	%	5.7	22.6	24.5	34.0	13.2	8.45	.7494

TABLE 61

SECTION A: UNIVERSITY ATTENDED

	UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA (percentage)					UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY (percentage)						
Item	S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
1	18.0	42.6	--	27.9	11.5	14.3	55.1	--	12.2	18.4	5.17	.1597
2	23.0	36.1	4.9	14.8	21.3	34.7	22.4	--	22.4	20.4	6.31	.1769
3	37.7	49.2	--	9.8	3.3	36.7	34.7	2.0	14.3	12.2	6.05	.1958
4	27.9	36.1	1.6	23.0	11.5	14.3	42.9	8.2	20.4	14.3	5.41	.2476
5	4.9	14.8	--	49.2	31.1	10.2	32.7	4.1	30.6	22.4	10.41	.0341
6	27.9	44.3	1.6	18.0	8.2	38.8	30.6	2.0	16.3	12.2	2.83	.5869
7	13.1	26.2	4.9	37.7	18.0	18.4	28.6	12.2	26.5	14.3	3.59	.4640
8	18.0	24.6	11.5	24.6	21.3	40.8	10.2	4.1	22.4	22.4	9.98	.0407
9	24.6	29.5	6.6	27.9	11.5	30.6	28.6	2.0	20.4	18.4	3.09	.5425
10	16.4	34.4	8.2	21.3	19.7	12.2	32.7	6.1	24.5	24.5	0.92	.9220
11	45.9	36.1	4.9	13.1	--	46.9	28.6	4.1	18.4	2.0	2.24	.6909
12	16.4	31.1	21.3	16.4	14.8	16.3	32.7	22.4	12.2	16.3	0.40	.9824
13	75.4	21.3	--	3.3	--	70.8	25.0	2.1	--	2.1	4.35	.3605
14	26.2	37.7	16.4	16.4	3.3	14.6	54.2	8.3	14.6	8.3	6.01	.1986
15	27.9	50.8	6.6	6.6	8.2	6.3	35.4	12.5	22.9	22.9	18.51	.0010
16	6.6	21.3	24.6	37.7	9.8	16.7	14.6	18.8	31.3	18.8	5.44	.2446

APPENDIX D

Section B
(Tables 62-70)

TABLE 62

SECTION B: TOTAL RESPONSES

(N = 110)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.
17	Raw	3	23	8	39	36
	%	2.8	21.1	7.3	35.8	33.0
18	Raw	5	23	29	37	15
	%	4.6	21.1	26.6	33.9	13.8
19	Raw	40	40	4	21	4
	%	36.7	36.7	3.7	19.3	3.7
20	Raw	2	27	15	28	37
	%	1.8	24.8	13.8	25.7	33.9
21	Raw	18	37	36	15	2
	%	16.7	34.3	33.3	13.9	1.9
22	Raw	48	25	4	20	12
	%	44.0	22.9	3.7	18.3	11.0
23	Raw	23	33	4	37	12
	%	21.1	30.3	3.7	33.9	11.0
24	Raw	26	50	10	20	4
	%	23.6	45.5	9.1	18.2	3.6
25	Raw	41	33	7	19	10
	%	37.3	30.0	6.4	17.3	9.1
26	Raw	8	37	3	28	34
	%	7.3	33.6	2.9	25.5	30.9
27	Raw	16	20	31	22	21
	%	14.5	18.2	28.2	20.0	19.1
28	Raw	23	35	17	21	14
	%	20.9	31.8	15.5	19.1	12.7
29	Raw	8	54	11	20	17
	%	7.3	49.1	10.0	18.2	15.5
30	Raw	27	36	16	23	8
	%	24.5	32.7	14.5	20.9	7.3
31	Raw	16	27	7	24	36
	%	14.5	24.5	6.4	21.8	32.7
32	Raw	16	26	13	33	22
	%	14.5	23.6	11.8	30.0	20.0
33	Raw	37	43	6	14	10
	%	33.6	39.1	5.5	12.7	9.1
34	Raw	31	56	2	9	12
	%	28.2	50.9	1.8	8.2	10.9
35	Raw	25	52	16	14	3
	%	22.7	47.3	14.5	12.7	2.7
36	Raw	48	43	8	11	--
	%	43.6	39.1	7.3	10.0	--

TABLE 63

SECTION B: EXPERIENCE LEVELS, PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS
(N = 39)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
17	Raw	1	4	5	21	7	18.88	.0155
	%	2.6	10.5	13.2	55.3	18.4		
18	Raw	—	14	6	16	2	18.22	.0197
	%	—	36.8	15.8	42.1	5.3		
19	Raw	8	15	3	10	2	11.49	.1757
	%	21.8	39.5	7.9	26.3	5.3		
20	Raw	1	15	2	17	3	41.80	.0000
	%	2.6	39.5	5.3	44.7	7.9		
21	Raw	3	21	4	9	1	26.22	.0010
	%	7.9	55.3	10.5	23.7	2.6		
22	Raw	14	14	2	8	—	15.93	.0434
	%	36.8	36.8	5.3	21.1	--		
23	Raw	4	13	1	17	3	17.10	.0291
	%	10.5	34.2	2.6	44.7	7.9		
24	Raw	7	22	4	6	—	6.78	.5608
	%	17.9	56.4	10.3	15.4	--		
25	Raw	15	13	--	9	2	7.42	.4920
	%	38.5	33.3	--	23.1	5.1		
26	Raw	—	18	2	13	6	18.41	.0184
	%	—	46.2	5.1	33.3	15.4		
27	Raw	13	12	6	7	1	36.52	.0000
	%	33.3	30.8	15.4	17.9	2.6		
28	Raw	3	11	13	9	3	22.65	.0038
	%	7.7	28.2	33.3	23.1	7.7		
29	Raw	4	23	5	5	2	10.03	.2631
	%	10.3	59.0	12.8	12.8	5.1		
30	Raw	12	16	3	8	--	10.68	.2202
	%	30.8	41.0	7.7	20.5	--		
31	Raw	9	10	3	9	8	11.69	.1658
	%	23.1	25.6	7.7	23.1	20.5		
32	Raw	7	15	9	6	2	24.02	.0023
	%	17.9	38.5	23.1	15.4	5.1		
33	Raw	10	23	1	4	1	19.30	.0133
	%	25.6	59.0	2.6	10.3	2.6		
34	Raw	14	22	--	—	3	20.23	.0095
	%	35.9	56.4	--	--	7.7		
35	Raw	8	20	7	4	—	5.69	.6816
	%	20.5	51.3	17.9	10.3	--		
36	Raw	15	18	2	4	--	5.82	.4431
	%	38.5	46.2	5.1	10.3	--		

TABLE 64

SECTION B: EXPERIENCE LEVELS, BEGINNING TEACHERS

(N = 21)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
17	Raw	--	7	2	5	7	18.88	.0155
	%	--	33.3	9.5	23.8	33.3		
18	Raw	1	4	8	5	3	18.22	.0197
	%	4.8	19.0	38.1	23.8	14.3		
19	Raw	7	8	--	5	1	11.49	.1757
	%	33.3	38.1	--	23.8	4.8		
20	Raw	1	4	5	7	4	41.80	.0000
	%	4.8	19.0	23.8	33.3	19.0		
21	Raw	3	4	12	2	--	26.22	.0010
	%	14.3	19.0	57.1	9.5	--		
22	Raw	11	5	--	3	2	15.93	.0434
	%	52.4	23.8	--	14.3	9.5		
23	Raw	4	7	3	6	1	17.10	.0291
	%	19.0	33.3	14.3	28.6	4.8		
24	Raw	5	7	3	5	1	6.78	.5608
	%	23.8	33.3	14.3	23.8	4.8		
25	Raw	7	6	3	3	2	7.42	.4920
	%	33.3	28.6	14.3	14.3	9.5		
26	Raw	1	5	1	4	10	18.41	.0184
	%	4.8	23.8	4.8	19.0	47.6		
27	Raw	1	1	8	7	4	36.52	.0000
	%	4.8	4.8	38.1	33.3	19.0		
28	Raw	4	9	2	4	2	22.65	.0038
	%	19.0	42.9	9.5	19.0	9.5		
29	Raw	--	9	2	4	6	10.03	.2631
	%	--	42.9	9.5	19.0	28.6		
30	Raw	5	8	3	3	2	10.68	.2202
	%	23.8	38.1	14.3	14.3	9.5		
31	Raw	--	5	3	4	9	11.69	.1658
	%	--	23.8	14.3	19.0	42.9		
32	Raw	3	4	1	7	6	24.02	.0023
	%	14.3	19.0	4.8	33.3	28.6		
33	Raw	3	8	2	4	4	19.30	.0133
	%	14.3	38.1	9.5	19.0	19.0		
34	Raw	5	11	2	3	--	20.23	.0095
	%	23.8	52.4	9.5	14.3	--		
35	Raw	4	10	3	4	--	5.69	.6816
	%	19.0	47.6	14.3	19.0	--		
36	Raw	12	8	1	--	--	5.83	.4431
	%	57.1	38.1	4.8	--	--		

TABLE 65

SECTION B: EXPERIENCE LEVELS, EXPERIENCED TEACHERS

(N = 50)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	X^2	Sig.
17	Raw	2	12	1	13	22	18.88	.0155
	%	4.0	24.0	2.0	26.0	44.0		
18	Raw	4	5	15	16	10	18.22	.0197
	%	8.0	10.0	30.0	32.0	20.0		
19	Raw	25	17	1	6	1	11.49	.1757
	%	50.0	34.0	2.0	12.0	2.0		
20	Raw	--	8	8	4	30	41.80	.0000
	%	--	16.0	16.0	8.0	60.0		
21	Raw	12	12	20	4	1	26.22	.0010
	%	24.5	24.5	40.8	8.2	2.0		
22	Raw	23	6	2	9	10	15.93	.0434
	%	46.0	12.0	4.0	18.0	20.0		
23	Raw	15	13	--	14	8	17.10	.0291
	%	30.0	26.0	--	28.0	16.0		
24	Raw	14	21	3	9	3	6.78	.5608
	%	28.0	42.0	6.0	18.0	6.0		
25	Raw	19	14	4	7	6	7.42	.4920
	%	38.0	28.0	8.0	14.0	12.0		
26	Raw	7	14	--	11	18	18.41	.0184
	%	14.0	28.0	--	22.0	36.0		
27	Raw	2	7	17	8	16	36.52	.0000
	%	4.0	14.0	34.0	16.0	32.0		
28	Raw	16	15	2	8	9	22.65	.0038
	%	32.0	30.0	4.0	16.0	18.0		
29	Raw	4	22	4	11	9	10.03	.2631
	%	8.0	44.0	8.0	22.0	18.0		
30	Raw	10	12	10	12	6	10.68	.2202
	%	20.0	24.0	20.0	24.0	12.0		
31	Raw	7	12	1	11	19	11.69	.1658
	%	14.0	24.0	2.0	22.0	38.0		
32	Raw	6	7	3	20	14	24.02	.0023
	%	12.0	14.0	6.0	40.0	28.0		
33	Raw	24	12	3	6	5	19.30	.0133
	%	48.0	24.0	6.0	12.0	10.0		
34	Raw	12	23	--	6	9	20.23	.0095
	%	24.0	46.0	--	12.0	18.0		
35	Raw	13	22	6	6	3	5.69	.6816
	%	26.0	44.0	12.0	12.0	6.0		
36	Raw	2	17	5	7	--	5.83	.4431
	%	42.0	34.0	10.0	14.0	--		

TABLE 66

SECTION B: PERCENTAGE OF ART TAUGHT, PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

(N = 39)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
17	Raw	1	4	5	21	7		
	%	2.6	10.5	13.2	55.3	18.4	20.98	.0506
18	Raw	--	14	6	16	2		
	%	--	36.8	15.8	42.1	5.3	20.22	.0630
19	Raw	8	15	3	10	2		
	%	21.1	39.5	7.9	26.3	5.3	18.33	.1059
20	Raw	1	15	2	17	3		
	%	2.6	39.5	5.3	44.7	7.9	32.93	.0010
21	Raw	3	21	4	9	1		
	%	7.9	55.3	10.5	23.7	2.6	38.56	.0001
22	Raw	14	14	2	8	--		
	%	36.8	36.8	5.3	21.1	--	18.33	.1061
23	Raw	4	13	1	17	3		
	%	10.5	34.2	2.6	44.7	7.9	13.77	.3158
24	Raw	7	22	4	6	--		
	%	17.9	56.4	10.3	15.4	--	18.81	.1570
25	Raw	15	13	--	9	2		
	%	38.5	33.3	--	23.1	5.1	13.01	.3681
26	Raw	--	18	2	13	6		
	%	--	46.2	5.1	33.3	15.4	21.93	.0383
27	Raw	13	12	6	7	1		
	%	33.3	30.8	15.4	17.9	2.6	39.79	.0001
28	Raw	3	11	13	9	3		
	%	7.7	28.2	33.3	23.1	7.7	32.56	.001
29	Raw	4	23	5	5	2		
	%	10.3	59.0	12.8	12.8	5.1	25.03	.0147
30	Raw	12	16	3	8	--		
	%	30.8	41.0	7.7	20.5	--	21.62	.0420
31	Raw	9	10	3	9	8		
	%	23.1	25.6	7.7	23.1	20.5	10.96	.5320
32	Raw	7	15	9	6	2		
	%	17.9	38.5	23.1	15.4	5.1	36.27	.0003
33	Raw	10	23	1	4	1		
	%	25.6	59.0	2.6	10.3	2.6	27.15	.0074
34	Raw	14	22	--	--	3		
	%	35.9	56.4	--	--	7.7	21.54	.0430
35	Raw	8	20	7	4	--		
	%	20.5	51.3	17.9	10.3	--	27.27	.0071
36	Raw	15	18	2	4	--		
	%	38.5	46.2	5.1	10.3	--	12.13	.2061

TABLE 67

SECTION B: PERCENTAGE OF ART TAUGHT, 26% to 50%

(N = 6)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
17	Raw	--	3	--	2	1		
	%	--	50.0	--	33.3	16.7	20.98	.0506
18	Raw	--	1	2	2	1		
	%	--	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	20.22	.0630
19	Raw	2	3	--	1	--		
	%	33.3	50.0	--	16.7	--	18.33	.1059
20	Raw	--	2	1	2	1		
	%	--	33.3	16.7	33.3	16.7	32.93	.0010
21	Raw	1	2	2	--	1		
	%	16.7	33.3	33.3	--	16.7	38.56	.0001
22	Raw	2	3	--	--	1		
	%	33.3	50.0	--	--	16.7	18.33	.1061
23	Raw	3	1	--	2	--		
	%	50.0	16.7	--	33.3	--	13.77	.3158
24	Raw	1	3	1	--	1		
	%	16.7	50.0	16.6	--	16.7	18.81	.1570
25	Raw	2	1	--	1	2		
	%	33.3	16.6	--	16.7	33.3	13.01	.3681
26	Raw	--	2	--	--	4		
	%	--	33.3	--	--	66.7	21.93	.0383
27	Raw	--	--	1	1	4		
	%	--	--	16.6	16.7	66.7	39.79	.0001
28	Raw	3	1	1	--	1		
	%	50.0	16.7	16.6	--	16.7	32.56	.0011
29	Raw	--	1	--	2	3		
	%	--	16.6	--	33.3	50.0	25.03	.0147
30	Raw	--	2	2	1	1		
	%	--	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	21.62	.0420
31	Raw	--	2	--	1	3		
	%	--	33.3	--	16.7	50.0	10.96	.5320
32	Raw	--	--	1	1	4		
	%	--	--	16.7	16.7	66.7	36.27	.0003
33	Raw	2	1	--	2	1		
	%	33.3	16.7	--	33.3	16.7	27.15	.0074
34	Raw	1	1	--	2	2		
	%	16.7	16.7	--	33.3	33.3	21.54	.0430
35	Raw	3	--	2	--	1		
	%	50.0	--	33.3	--	16.7	27.27	.0071
36	Raw	5	1	--	--	--		
	%	83.3	16.7	--	--	--	12.13	.2061

TABLE 68

SECTION B: PERCENTAGE OF ART TAUGHT, 51% to 75%

(N = 12)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	X^2	Sig.
17	Raw	--	4	--	2	6		
	%	--	33.3	--	16.7	50.0	20.98	.0506
18	Raw	2	2	3	3	2		
	%	16.7	16.7	25.0	25.0	16.7	20.22	.0630
19	Raw	6	2	--	2	2		
	%	50.0	16.7	--	16.7	16.7	18.33	.1059
20	Raw	--	3	2	2	5		
	%	--	25.0	16.7	16.7	41.7	32.93	.0010
21	Raw	1	5	3	2	--		
	%	9.1	45.5	27.3	18.2	--	38.56	.0001
22	Raw	7	1	--	2	2		
	%	58.3	8.3	--	16.7	16.7	18.33	.1061
23	Raw	5	3	1	1	2		
	%	41.7	25.0	8.3	8.3	16.7	13.77	.3158
24	Raw	4	4	--	2	2		
	%	33.3	33.3	--	16.7	16.7	18.81	.1570
25	Raw	3	4	1	3	1		
	%	25.0	33.3	8.3	25.0	8.3	13.01	.3681
26	Raw	1	1	--	4	6		
	%	8.3	8.3	--	33.3	50.0	21.93	.0383
27	Raw	--	1	4	3	4		
	%	--	8.3	33.3	25.0	33.3	39.79	.0001
28	Raw	2	1	2	3	4		
	%	16.7	8.3	16.7	25.0	33.3	32.56	.0011
29	Raw	--	3	1	2	6		
	%	--	25.0	8.3	16.7	50.0	25.03	.0147
30	Raw	3	--	4	2	3		
	%	25.0	--	33.3	16.7	25.0	21.62	.0420
31	Raw	3	1	1	3	4		
	%	25.0	8.3	8.3	25.0	33.3	10.96	.5320
32	Raw	4	2	--	4	2		
	%	33.3	16.7	--	33.3	16.7	36.27	.0003
33	Raw	2	2	1	5	2		
	%	16.7	16.7	8.3	41.7	16.7	27.15	.0074
34	Raw	2	5	1	1	3		
	%	16.7	41.7	8.3	8.3	25.0	21.54	.0430
35	Raw	3	4	--	3	2		
	%	25.0	33.3	--	25.0	16.7	27.27	.0071
36	Raw	9	2	1	--	--		
	%	75.0	16.7	8.3	--	--	12.13	.2061

TABLE 69

SECTION B: PERCENTAGE OF ART TAUGHT, 76% to 100%

(N = 53)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	X^2	Sig.
17	Raw	2	12	3	14	22		
	%	3.8	22.6	5.7	26.4	41.5	20.98	.0506
18	Raw	3	6	18	16	10		
	%	5.7	11.3	34.0	30.2	18.9	20.22	.0630
19	Raw	24	20	1	8	--		
	%	45.3	37.7	1.9	15.1	--	18.33	.1059
20	Raw	1	7	10	7	28		
	%	1.9	13.2	18.9	13.2	52.8	32.93	.0010
21	Raw	13	9	27	4	--		
	%	24.5	17.0	50.9	7.5	--	38.56	.0001
22	Raw	25	7	2	10	9		
	%	47.2	13.2	3.8	18.9	17.0	18.33	.1061
23	Raw	11	16	2	17	7		
	%	20.8	30.2	3.8	32.1	13.2	13.77	.3158
24	Raw	14	21	5	12	1		
	%	26.4	39.6	9.4	22.6	1.9	18.81	.1570
25	Raw	21	15	6	6	5		
	%	39.6	28.3	11.3	11.3	9.4	13.01	.3681
26	Raw	7	16	1	11	18		
	%	13.2	30.2	1.9	20.8	34.0	21.93	.0383
27	Raw	3	7	20	11	12		
	%	5.7	13.2	37.7	20.8	22.6	39.79	.0001
28	Raw	15	22	1	9	6		
	%	28.3	41.5	1.9	17.0	11.3	32.56	.0011
29	Raw	4	27	5	11	6		
	%	7.5	50.9	9.4	20.8	11.3	25.03	.0147
30	Raw	12	18	7	12	4		
	%	22.6	34.0	13.2	22.6	7.5	21.62	.0420
31	Raw	4	14	3	11	21		
	%	7.5	26.4	5.7	20.8	39.6	10.96	.5320
32	Raw	5	9	3	22	14		
	%	9.4	17.0	5.7	41.5	26.4	36.27	.0003
33	Raw	23	17	4	3	6		
	%	43.4	32.1	7.5	5.7	11.3	27.15	.0074
34	Raw	14	28	1	6	4		
	%	26.4	52.8	1.9	11.3	7.5	21.54	.0430
35	Raw	11	28	7	7	--		
	%	20.8	52.8	13.2	13.2	--	27.27	.0071
36	Raw	19	22	5	7	--		
	%	35.8	41.5	9.4	13.2	--	12.13	.2061

TABLE 70

SECTION B: UNIVERSITY ATTENDED

	UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA					UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY						
	(percentage)					(percentage)						
Item	S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	X^2	Sig.
17	3.3	26.2	4.9	36.1	29.5	2.1	14.6	10.4	35.4	37.5	3.50	.4786
18	4.9	19.7	21.3	39.3	14.8	4.2	22.9	33.3	27.1	12.5	2.92	.5721
19	39.3	39.3	1.6	16.4	3.3	33.3	33.3	6.3	22.9	4.2	2.74	.6029
20	3.3	19.7	16.4	34.4	26.2	--	31.3	10.4	14.6	43.8	10.27	.0361
21	15.0	38.3	28.3	16.7	1.7	18.8	29.2	39.6	10.4	2.1	2.67	.6151
22	45.9	26.2	3.3	19.7	4.9	41.7	18.8	4.2	16.7	18.8	5.62	.2291
23	16.4	29.5	3.3	39.3	11.5	27.1	31.3	4.2	27.1	10.4	2.76	.5994
24	23.0	44.3	11.5	16.4	4.9	24.5	46.9	6.1	20.4	2.0	1.79	.7750
25	26.2	32.8	6.6	23.0	11.5	51.0	26.5	6.1	10.2	6.1	8.26	.0827
26	4.9	31.1	4.9	29.5	29.5	10.2	36.7	--	20.4	32.7	4.68	.3221
27	16.4	23.0	26.2	19.7	14.8	12.2	12.2	30.6	20.4	24.5	3.58	.4664
28	14.8	34.4	23.0	14.8	13.1	28.6	28.6	6.1	24.5	12.2	9.12	.0582
29	4.9	55.7	9.8	14.8	14.8	10.2	40.8	10.2	22.4	16.3	3.21	.5236
30	21.3	32.8	16.4	21.3	8.2	28.6	32.7	12.2	20.4	6.1	1.08	.8980
31	13.1	19.7	6.6	29.5	31.1	16.3	30.6	6.1	12.2	34.7	5.34	.2540
32	16.4	24.6	13.1	27.9	18.0	12.2	22.4	10.2	32.7	22.4	1.04	.9035
33	27.9	42.6	4.9	14.8	9.8	40.8	34.7	6.1	10.2	8.2	2.39	.6646
34	29.5	55.7	--	4.9	9.8	26.5	44.9	4.1	12.2	12.2	5.13	.2742
35	18.0	49.2	14.8	14.8	3.3	28.6	44.9	14.3	10.2	2.0	2.03	.7299
36	42.6	37.7	11.5	8.2	--	44.9	40.8	2.0	12.2	--	3.87	.2758

APPENDIX E

Section C
(Tables 71-79)

TABLE 71

SECTION C: TOTAL RESPONSES

(N = 110)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.
37	Raw	12	43	6	36	13
	%	10.9	39.1	5.5	32.7	11.8
38	Raw	4	13	3	45	45
	%	3.6	11.8	2.7	40.9	40.9
39	Raw	6	39	6	47	12
	%	5.5	35.5	5.5	42.7	10.9
40	Raw	63	36	2	7	2
	%	57.3	32.7	1.8	6.4	1.8
41	Raw	10	23	3	43	31
	%	9.1	20.9	2.7	39.1	28.2
42	Raw	28	29	13	21	17
	%	25.9	26.9	12.0	19.4	15.7
43	Raw	5	19	11	49	25
	%	4.6	17.4	10.1	45.0	22.9
44	Raw	46	59	--	4	1
	%	41.8	53.6	--	3.6	0.9
45	Raw	20	40	10	30	10
	%	18.2	36.4	9.1	27.3	9.1
46	Raw	23	46	6	29	6
	%	20.9	41.8	5.5	26.4	5.5
47	Raw	17	47	7	27	12
	%	15.5	42.7	6.4	24.5	10.9
48	Raw	85	21	4	--	--
	%	77.3	19.1	3.6	--	--
49	Raw	38	35	5	25	7
	%	34.5	31.8	4.5	22.7	6.4
50	Raw	4	26	8	58	14
	%	3.6	23.6	7.3	52.7	12.7

TABLE 72

SECTION C: EXPERIENCE LEVELS, PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

(N = 39)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
37	Raw	4	17	5	12	1		
	%	10.3	43.6	12.8	30.8	2.6	15.58	.0488
38	Raw	1	3	1	20	14		
	%	2.6	7.7	2.6	51.3	35.9	9.70	.2869
39	Raw	3	15	2	18	1		
	%	7.7	38.5	5.1	46.2	2.6	6.12	.6334
40	Raw	20	14	2	3	--		
	%	51.3	35.9	5.1	7.7	--	6.19	.6260
41	Raw	1	6	2	18	12		
	%	2.6	15.4	5.1	46.2	30.8	17.25	.0276
42	Raw	10	10	4	9	6		
	%	25.6	25.6	10.3	23.1	15.4	7.90	.4434
43	Raw	1	5	4	20	8		
	%	2.6	13.2	10.5	52.6	21.1	8.36	.3994
44	Raw	14	24	--	1	--		
	%	35.9	61.5	--	2.6	--	6.23	.3982
45	Raw	4	15	9	10	1		
	%	10.3	38.5	23.1	25.6	2.6	23.47	.0028
46	Raw	--	19	4	14	2		
	%	--	48.7	10.3	35.9	5.1	24.09	.0022
47	Raw	2	18	3	12	4		
	%	5.1	46.2	7.7	30.8	10.3	7.18	.5174
48	Raw	30	8	1	--	--		
	%	76.9	20.5	2.6	--	--	5.14	.2735
49	Raw	8	18	3	10	--		
	%	20.5	46.2	7.7	25.6	--	14.77	.0638
50	Raw	--	10	2	22	5		
	%	--	25.6	5.1	56.4	12.8	10.96	.2041

TABLE 73

SECTION C: EXPERIENCE LEVELS, BEGINNING TEACHERS

(N = 21)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	X^2	Sig.
37	Raw	1	7	--	7	6		
	%	4.8	33.3	--	33.3	28.6	15.58	.0488
38	Raw	--	3	2	8	8		
	%	--	14.3	9.5	38.1	38.1	9.70	.2869
39	Raw	--	7	1	10	3		
	%	--	33.3	4.8	47.6	14.3	6.12	.6334
40	Raw	13	6	--	1	1		
	%	61.9	28.6	--	4.8	4.8	6.19	.6260
41	Raw	1	10	--	5	5		
	%	4.8	47.6	--	23.8	23.8	17.25	.0276
42	Raw	4	8	5	3	1		
	%	19.0	38.1	23.8	14.3	4.8	7.90	.4434
43	Raw	--	4	--	10	7		
	%	--	19.0	--	47.6	33.3	8.36	.3994
44	Raw	7	12	--	2	--		
	%	33.3	57.1	--	9.5	--	6.23	.3982
45	Raw	7	9	--	4	1		
	%	33.3	42.9	--	19.0	4.8	23.47	.0028
46	Raw	7	12	--	1	1		
	%	33.3	57.1	--	4.8	4.8	24.09	.0022
47	Raw	4	11	1	3	2		
	%	19.0	52.4	4.8	14.3	9.5	7.18	.5174
48	Raw	13	6	2	--	--		
	%	61.9	28.6	9.5	--	--	5.14	.2735
49	Raw	9	6	--	5	1		
	%	42.9	28.6	--	23.8	4.8	14.77	.0638
50	Raw	--	7	2	12	--		
	%	--	33.3	9.5	57.1	--	10.96	.2041

TABLE 74

SECTION C: EXPERIENCE LEVELS, EXPERIENCED TEACHERS

(N = 50)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
37	Raw	7	19	1	17	6		
	%	14.0	38.0	2.0	34.0	12.0	15.58	.0488
38	Raw	3	7	--	17	23		
	%	6.0	14.0	--	34.0	46.0	9.70	.2869
39	Raw	3	17	3	19	8		
	%	6.0	34.0	6.0	38.0	16.0	6.12	.6334
40	Raw	30	16	--	3	1		
	%	60.0	32.0	--	6.0	2.0	6.19	.6260
41	Raw	8	7	1	20	14		
	%	16.0	14.0	2.0	40.0	28.0	17.25	.0276
42	Raw	14	11	4	9	10		
	%	29.2	22.9	8.3	18.8	20.8	7.90	.4434
43	Raw	4	10	7	19	10		
	%	8.0	20.0	14.0	38.0	20.0	8.36	.3994
44	Raw	25	23	--	1	1		
	%	50.0	46.0	--	2.0	2.0	6.23	.3982
45	Raw	9	16	1	16	8		
	%	18.0	32.0	2.0	32.0	16.0	23.47	.0028
46	Raw	16	15	2	14	3		
	%	32.0	30.0	4.0	28.0	6.0	24.09	.0022
47	Raw	11	18	3	12	6		
	%	22.0	36.0	6.0	24.0	12.0	7.18	.5174
48	Raw	42	7	1	--	--		
	%	84.0	14.0	2.0	--	--	5.14	.2735
49	Raw	21	11	2	10	6		
	%	42.0	22.0	4.0	20.0	12.0	14.77	.0638
50	Raw	84	9	4	24	9		
	%	8.0	18.0	8.0	48.0	18.0	10.96	.2041

TABLE 75

SECTION C: PERCENTAGE OF ART TAUGHT, PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

(N = 39)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
37	Raw	4	17	5	12	1		
	%	10.3	43.6	12.8	30.8	2.6	29.92	.0029
38	Raw	1	3	1	20	14		
	%	2.6	7.7	2.6	51.3	35.9	18.81	.0931
39	Raw	3	15	2	18	1		
	%	7.7	38.5	5.1	46.2	2.6	12.76	.3865
40	Raw	20	14	2	3	--		
	%	51.3	35.9	5.1	7.7	--	8.56	.7398
41	Raw	1	6	2	18	12		
	%	2.6	15.4	5.1	46.2	30.8	10.53	.5696
42	Raw	10	10	4	9	6		
	%	25.6	25.6	10.3	23.1	15.4	11.39	.4962
43	Raw	1	5	4	20	8		
	%	2.6	13.2	10.5	52.6	21.1	5.83	.9246
44	Raw	14	24	--	1	--		
	%	35.9	61.5	--	26	--	13.64	.1358
45	Raw	4	15	9	10	1		
	%	10.3	38.5	23.1	25.6	2.6	21.45	.0441
46	Raw	--	19	4	14	2		
	%	--	48.7	10.3	35.9	5.1	30.96	.0020
47	Raw	2	18	3	12	4		
	%	5.1	46.2	7.7	30.8	10.3	12.27	.4246
48	Raw	30	8	1	--	--		
	%	76.9	20.5	2.6	--	--	4.87	.5612
49	Raw	8	18	3	10	--		
	%	20.5	46.2	7.7	25.6	--	15.69	.2056
50	Raw	--	10	2	22	5		
	%	--	25.6	5.1	56.4	12.8	13.72	.3190

TABLE 76

SECTION C: PERCENTAGE OF ART TAUGHT, 26% to 50%

(N = 6)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D	χ^2	Sig.
37	Raw	1	1	--	1	3		
	%	16.7	16.7	--	16.7	50.0	29.92	.0029
38	Raw	1	--	--	3	2		
	%	16.7	--	--	50.0	33.3	18.81	.0931
39	Raw	--	--	--	5	1		
	%	--	--	--	83.3	16.7	12.76	.3865
40	Raw	4	1	--	1	--		
	%	66.7	16.7	--	16.7	--	8.56	.7398
41	Raw	1	1	--	4	--		
	%	16.7	16.7	--	66.7	--	10.53	.5696
42	Raw	2	2	1	1	--		
	%	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	--	11.39	.4962
43	Raw	1	1	--	2	2		
	%	16.7	16.7	--	33.3	33.3	5.83	.9246
44	Raw	4	2	--	--	--		
	%	66.7	33.3	--	--	--	13.64	.1358
45	Raw	2	1	--	2	1		
	%	33.3	16.7	--	33.3	16.7	21.45	.0441
46	Raw	1	3	--	2	--		
	%	16.7	50.0	--	33.3	--	30.96	.0020
47	Raw	1	4	--	1	--		
	%	16.7	66.7	--	16.7	--	12.27	.4246
48	Raw	3	2	1	--	--		
	%	50.0	33.3	16.7	--	--	4.87	.5612
49	Raw	3	2	--	1	--		
	%	50.0	33.3	--	16.7	--	15.69	.2056
50	Raw	1	2	--	2	1		
	%	16.7	33.3	--	33.3	10.7	13.72	.3190

TABLE 77

SECTION C: PERCENTAGE OF ART TAUGHT, 51% to 75%

(N = 12)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	X^2	Sig.
37	Raw	1	2	--	4	5	29.92	.0029
	%	8.3	16.7	--	33.3	41.7		
38	Raw	2	--	--	5	5	18.81	.0931
	%	16.7	--	--	41.7	41.7		
39	Raw	--	5	1	3	3	12.76	.3865
	%	--	41.7	8.3	25.0	25.0		
40	Raw	7	4	--	1	--	8.56	.7398
	%	58.3	33.3	--	8.3	--		
41	Raw	2	2	--	4	4	10.53	.5696
	%	16.7	16.7	--	33.3	33.3		
42	Raw	6	--	1	1	3	11.39	.4962
	%	54.5	--	9.1	9.1	27.3		
43	Raw	1	2	1	6	2	5.83	.9246
	%	8.3	16.7	8.3	50.0	16.7		
44	Raw	3	8	--	--	1	13.64	.1358
	%	25.0	66.7	--	--	8.3		
45	Raw	4	3	--	4	1	21.45	.0441
	%	33.3	25.0	--	33.3	8.3		
46	Raw	8	4	--	--	--	30.96	.0020
	%	66.7	33.3	--	--	--		
47	Raw	3	7	--	2	--	12.27	.4246
	%	25.0	58.3	--	16.7	--		
48	Raw	10	2	--	--	--	4.87	.5612
	%	83.3	16.7	--	--	--		
49	Raw	4	3	--	3	2	15.69	.2056
	%	33.3	25.0	--	25.0	16.7		
50	Raw	2	1	1	7	1	13.72	.3190
	%	16.7	8.3	8.3	58.3	8.3		

TABLE 78

SECTION C: PERCENTAGE OF ART TAUGHT, 76% to 100%

(N = 53)

Item		S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
37	Raw	6	23	1	19	4		
	%	11.3	43.4	1.9	35.8	7.5	29.92	.0029
38	Raw	--	10	2	17	24		
	%	--	18.9	3.8	32.1	45.3	18.81	.0931
39	Raw	3	19	3	21	7		
	%	5.7	35.8	5.7	39.6	13.2	12.76	.3865
40	Raw	32	17	--	2	2		
	%	60.4	32.1	--	3.8	3.8	8.56	.7398
41	Raw	6	14	1	17	15		
	%	11.3	26.4	1.9	32.1	28.3	10.53	.5696
42	Raw	10	17	7	10	8		
	%	19.2	32.7	13.5	19.2	15.4	11.39	.4962
43	Raw	2	11	6	21	13		
	%	3.8	20.8	11.3	39.6	24.5	5.83	.9246
44	Raw	25	25	--	3	--		
	%	47.2	47.2	--	5.7	--	13.64	.1358
45	Raw	10	21	1	14	7		
	%	18.9	39.6	1.9	26.4	13.2	21.45	.0441
46	Raw	14	20	2	13	4		
	%	26.4	37.7	3.8	24.5	7.5	30.96	.0020
47	Raw	11	18	4	12	8		
	%	20.8	34.0	7.5	22.6	15.1	12.27	.4246
48	Raw	42	9	2	--	--		
	%	79.2	17.0	3.8	--	--	4.87	.5612
49	Raw	23	12	2	11	5		
	%	43.4	22.6	3.8	20.8	9.4	15.69	.2056
50	Raw	1	13	5	27	7		
	%	1.9	24.5	9.4	50.9	13.2	13.72	.3190

TABLE 79

SECTION C: UNIVERSITY ATTENDED

	UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA (percentage)					UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY (percentage)						
Item	S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	S.A.	M.A.	N	M.D.	S.D.	χ^2	Sig.
37	11.5	31.1	4.9	41.0	11.5	10.2	49.0	6.1	22.4	12.2	5.19	.2685
38	3.3	9.8	3.3	49.2	34.4	4.1	14.3	2.0	30.6	49.0	4.35	.3603
39	6.6	32.8	6.6	42.6	11.5	4.1	38.8	4.1	42.9	10.2	0.93	.9208
40	49.2	37.7	3.3	8.2	1.6	67.3	26.5	--	4.1	2.0	4.96	.2918
41	9.8	21.3	3.3	45.9	19.7	8.2	20.4	2.0	30.6	38.8	5.39	.2495
42	32.2	27.1	8.5	22.0	10.2	18.4	26.5	16.3	16.3	22.4	6.36	.1736
43	5.0	11.7	10.0	56.7	16.7	4.1	24.5	10.2	30.6	30.6	8.96	.0622
44	37.7	59.0	--	1.6	1.6	46.9	46.9	--	6.1	--	3.60	.3083
45	18.0	34.4	13.1	27.9	6.6	18.4	38.8	4.1	26.5	12.2	3.57	.4678
46	23.0	41.0	3.3	27.9	4.9	18.4	42.9	8.2	24.5	6.1	1.67	.7954
47	18.0	47.5	4.9	26.2	3.3	12.2	36.7	8.2	22.4	20.4	9.25	.0552
48	73.8	21.3	4.9	--	--	81.6	16.3	2.0	--	--	1.18	.5517
49	37.7	36.1	3.3	16.4	6.6	30.6	26.5	6.1	30.6	6.1	4.08	.3952
50	4.9	31.1	4.9	50.8	8.2	2.0	14.3	10.2	55.1	18.4	7.23	.1240